

INTERNATIONAL
JOINT
COMMISSION
Canada and United States



COMMISSION
MIXTE
INTERNATIONALE
Canada et États-Unis

**Transcript of the public meeting held by
the International Joint Commission
on the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement Review
at Windsor, Ontario, on November 2, 2005
(duration: 60 minutes)**

*

**Transcription de la réunion publique tenue par
la Commission mixte internationale
sur l'examen de l'Accord relatif à la qualité de
l'eau dans les Grands Lacs
à Windsor (Ontario) le 2 novembre 2005
(durée : 60 minutes)**

HERB GRAY (Chair, Canadian Section, International Joint Commission):
...generous in the seats they gave us, and more to be expected. So don't feel like you're in church on Sunday, don't loiter at the back, feel free to come up and sit at the front if you'd like.

You don't have to, but as I say, we didn't expect to have this many chairs set up, or at least I didn't anyway. So feel free to come up to the front.

And I know there's still people signing in. Well, we've gone a little past that. So we have a special feature for the opening, and I'd like to call on Bill Baker, senior advisor to the Mayor, and he'll explain why the Mayor isn't here, and he has a very interesting message for us. Bill, could you come up to the platform, please?

BILL BAKER (Special Advisor to Eddie Francis, Mayor of Windsor):
Thank you, Mr. Gray. Good evening. I have been asked tonight to bring greetings on behalf of the Mayor and City Council. Unfortunately, the Mayor could not be here to bring greetings to this very important public meetings for the IJC Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, as he had to attend funeral visitations for some of our citizens tonight, as you're well aware.

Windsor has the privilege of hosting one of 14 such meetings in Great Lakes communities on both sides of the international border. The City of Windsor is pleased to be chosen to host this meeting, because our region is bordered on three sites by Great Lakes waters, and the good condition of those

waters is imperative for our well-being now and our health, growth, and progress in the future.

Mayor Francis, as a member of the board of directors for the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Cities Initiative, which is comprised of mayors of the eight states and two provinces with responsibilities of Great Lakes, is deeply committed to the health of our Great Lakes watershed basin.

The City of Windsor thanks the International Joint Commission for including the city among meeting locales. We urge our citizens to come forward with their concerns and help Windsor to be in the forefront not only in identifying Great Lakes water quality problems, but in suggesting solutions as well. Thank you very much. (APPLAUSE)

HERB GRAY: Bill, thank you very much. And I think we of the Commission and the audience would like you to convey to Mayor Francis our thanks for his assistance and your office's assistance in putting this function together.

The City has been very supportive and generous in helping with the facilities and making known the meeting to the public, and it's certainly appreciated.

Now, good evening and welcome to our public meeting on the review of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement. There will be no surprise if I tell you I'm Herb Gray, and I'm joined by my colleague, the American Chair of the IJC, Dennis Schornack, who is seated to my right.

And we are here because the governments of the United States and Canada asked the International Joint Commission to find out what you think the governments should consider as they begin their review of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement in the spring of 2006.

The governments asked us to do this because the Commission has been involved with the Agreement since its inception. In fact, the 1972 Agreement, in a large part, comes out of a 1970 International Joint Commission report on the poor water quality of the Great Lakes.

In 1972, when the Great Lakes were suffering from heavy loadings of conventional pollutants, the governments signed a visionary agreement that focused on reducing pollution from municipal and industrial sources, and in particular on controlling...more than controlling, limiting the input of phosphorus.

The governments recognized that it would be necessary to adapt to new challenges, so in 1978, they signed a new Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, and that Agreement took an ecosystem approach and focused on persistent toxic substances.

By ecosystem approach, well, we talk about ecosystem, the Agreement says it's the interaction of air, land, water, and living creatures in and around the Great Lakes basin, including human beings.

Anyway, a protocol was added to the Agreement in 1987 to address degraded conditions in Great Lakes Areas of Concern and to reduce critical pollutants on a lake-wide basis.

Now under the Agreement, Canada and the United States have set common objectives for a variety of pollutants, they agreed to implement a range of research, monitoring, and pollution control activities, and efforts in both countries have in fact resulted in dramatic reductions in discharges of nutrients and toxic pollutants, particularly from industrial and municipal sources.

Now, I should note under the current agreement, the International Joint Commission reports at least biannually on matters relating to water quality in the Great Lakes.

In other words, every two years, we're required to make a major report on the overall progress, or lack of it, in the cleaning of the Great Lakes by the two governments, and we have to indicate progress toward achieving the purpose and the specific provisions of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement.

It has issued 12 such reports, the last one in September of 2004. They're all available online at www.ijc.org.

I should add that the governments have written the Commission into the Agreement, they've given us a permanent reference or mandate not only to give these reports every two years, but to oversee the application of the Agreement and report on anything that the Agreement covers whenever we want to do so.

Now the Agreement has resulted in binational initiatives that have brought about important results. For instance, Canadians and Americans have set the same limits on total phosphorus loads for each lake, and they have agreed that approaches to address persistent toxic substances will be guided by a philosophy of zero discharge. Both countries have made major advances in understanding the dynamics of this complex ecosystem.

Now the Agreement provides a framework for binational goals and cooperative efforts to restore and protect the Great Lakes, but the governments have not made any changes to the Agreement since the 1987 Protocol nearly 20 odd years ago. There is widespread recognition that parts of the Agreement, such as some of the numeric objectives, are out of date.

At the same time, there are several issues that require binational cooperation, either under the Agreement or through a separate process, such as preventing the introduction of aquatic alien invasive species, reducing the impacts of land use activities, and conducting research programs that will enable us to better understand large-scale ecosystem changes.

Now currently, there are other domestic policy initiatives underway that will frame Great Lakes restoration efforts in each country. These include the Great Lakes Regional Collaboration in the United States, and the forthcoming renewal of the Canada-Ontario Agreement Respecting the Great Lakes Basin Ecosystem.

So this makes the forthcoming review of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement by the two governments a very timely endeavour.

Now the two governments are now getting ready to review the Agreement, and they expect to begin the formal review required by the Agreement next March. And in preparation for that, they have asked us to hold these meetings to find out the views of the population around the Great Lakes, your views, on how well the Agreement has worked and what, if anything, needs to be changed.

The governments believe, the IJC believes it's very important for the Great Lakes community to be heard at this stage so that the two governments get a sense of your priorities before they begin their formal review early next year.

Now they hope to make the final terms of reference for the review available to the public in early December. They published a plan for comment at the beginning of this year, and they told us a week or two ago in Ottawa they want to make this plan public by early December so you'll know how the formal review will be carried out.

Now the two governments have said there will be additional opportunities for public input once they begin their review of the Agreement. They also have said they will consult with First Nations and Tribes on a government-to-government basis, although people of First Nations communities are also welcome to attend the 15 public meetings around the basin.

Now as indicated on the slide behind us here and in our printed materials, , there are several ways to comment to us, that's by e-mail, by toll-free telephone,

by fax, I guess by old-fashioned snail mail if you want, and there will also be a live Web dialogue you can participate in from November 29th through December 2nd.

Now when the consultations end, the International Joint Commission will write a report synthesizing all of the views that it has heard. We'll also send all of the documents we received, along with the transcripts of these meetings, to the governments.

This report will be a public document, as are all our reports, and information about it, the text, will be published on our Web site.

By the way, the comments made at all of the meetings that we're having around the Lakes will appear shortly after each meeting on the Web site. So if you'd like to see a report of the comments made here or at other meetings, just check our Web site.

As for our meeting today, we will call you in the order we received your request to speak. If you do wish to speak and you haven't done so as yet, please fill in the registrations form. If you need a form, please raise your hand and our staff will bring you one, or you can go back to the table at the door.

And we are relying on a tape recording to produce the transcript, so when you come forward, please sit down at the table, make sure you speak into the microphone.

And I'm not setting a time limit at this point, I don't know exactly how many have indicated they want to speak, but we're booked to be here from 7:00

to 9:00, there should be plenty of time for everybody to be heard, everyone who wants to speak, and I think we'll give everybody an opportunity within the time limited and set.

So now, I am going to go back to the table and I will conduct the balance of the meeting from there, and I'll let you know who is going to speak first and who the next person will be.

So I would now like to call forward Mrs. Diantha Dowdell (?), and she marked here I wish to speak maybe...well, no ifs, ands, buts or maybes, Mrs. Dowdell, come up to the microphone. Can I be heard? Is Mrs. Dowdell heard?

UNIDENTIFIED: Yep.

HERB GRAY: So none of this maybe stuff. Please sit down and we would be delighted to hear your views.

DIANTHA DOWDELL: Good evening, Honourable Herb Gray, and the gentleman from Detroit. I am Diantha Dowdell, I live at 8190 Riverside Drive East. I am a riparian living on the Detroit River at the bottom of Lake St. Clair. I look at Belle Isle and Peachy (?), and our water is getting dirtier.

I have seven children married and 21 grandchildren and we like to swim. We have the only beach in our area, and I'm as concerned about the water as you are.

It appears that we get a lot...because we have several high-rise apartments ease of us, we get a lot of foamy water certain times, so I think a lot of this is from washing machines and dishwashing machines, so that's some of the

potassium. I often wonder what happens when everybody flushes in those apartments. I hope it isn't going in the river.

We have fewer zebra mussels this year. I don't know why. For a while, they helped clean up the water. It was clearer where I lived.

Around August 1st, the weeds start dying in Lake St. Clair, and again, we get all the foam coming down the river, and that's natural, that's a natural phenomenon.

And wind direction, if we get southwesterly, it takes it all across the river...I mean, yes, and if it's northwesterly or northeasterly, then we get a lot of stuff, but it goes down the river.

Also, last year we had five dead birds, very unusual, but this year we only had one. Another thing is some of our neighbours are using the river for yard debris and disposal, and we write letters to the editor and hope that helps to remind the new people moving in that we have good garbage collection in the City of Windsor.

Also, some of the fishermen, we get these peculiar bags on our riverfront and peculiar bottles of their waste, you know.

So generally, I just like what you're doing. We appreciate what you did, MR. Gray, for us when we had the flooding in the 70s and the 80s, when you were with the government and helped us with the sandbagging and the diking. And that's all I've got to say. Thank you very much.

HERB GRAY: Well, thank you for your comments. Before I proceed, I should have done this at the beginning, I want to call on my distinguished co-chair Dennis Schornack to see if he has any additional words of greeting.

And like myself, he is a Great Lakes person, grown up in Michigan and having worked for years as a senior advisor on these kinds of issues to Governor Engler.

So I am delighted to work with him, and so that I'll still be delighted, I'd better recognize him to give him a few words of greeting, and after that, he'll be followed by John Taylor.

DENNIS SCHORNACK (Chair, U.S. Section, International Joint Commission): Well, thank you, Chair Gray. I'll be very brief.

And I think you've really...your opening comments really set the context for tonight's public meeting, and that is that, as you have mentioned, this is really a prelude to the negotiation or review and potential revision of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement by the government of Canada and the United States.

The comments that we gather tonight will be submitted to the two governments. And the IJC itself, as a principal advisor to the two governments on this agreement, will submit its own recommendation to the government with respect to how this agreement might be improved and strengthened and how it might see us through yet another generation of restoration efforts in the Great Lakes.

So I really have very little else to say, other than this is a very exciting time. Chair Gray mentioned some of the activities in the United States, the regional collaboration, this is also preliminary to the re-authorization – I don't know what you would call it exactly – but the renegotiation of the Canada-Ontario Agreement, and of course, there is the work on the Annex that deals with water quantity.

This agreement is focused on water quality, and we've heard in several meetings already that people like that focus, that it's been effective with respect to point source discharges into the Lakes over the last 30 years, that municipal and industrial point source discharges have been brought under control and fewer inputs are being made to the Lakes, but then we have new challenges as well that the Agreement may or may not address as adequately as it should.

And we're most interested, though, tonight in hearing what views you have and to be able to pass those views onto the two governments as they commence this coming March what we've been told will be a very serious review.

This agreement has not been revised since 1987, nearly two decades, and so it's an opportune time for you to weigh in. And I thank you for your attendance tonight. And so with that, I'm going to get back to Chair Gray and the public comments.

HERB GRAY: So I'd invite John Taylor to come to the table. And we are delighted to welcome Mr. Taylor, he's come from Grand Rapids. I guess this

works...this works better than the other microphone. So Mr. Taylor, we would invite you to make your presentation.

JOHN TAYLOR (Professor of Marketing and Logistics, Seidman College of Business, Grand Valley State University, Grand Rapids, Michigan): Chairman Gray and Chairman Schornack, thank you for the opportunity to present my views tonight at this forum.

Since 1987, there have been a number of developments as it relates to invasive species and awareness of invasive species, and I want to talk on that subject and the control of invasive species.

Let me begin just by saying that I am a Professor of Marketing and Logistics in the Seidman College of Business at Grand Valley State University in Grand Rapids, Michigan.

My biases are probably towards shippers and towards carriers, and my background is in transportation policy primarily.

In saying that, I want to focus a little bit on the research that I have been doing over the last year on the benefits of ocean shipping in the Great Lakes. And the reason I have undertaken that research is because we know there are significant damages from invasive species that come about as a result of ocean shipping in the Great Lakes, but there really hasn't been very good data available about what the benefits are.

What are the benefits of ocean shipping, bringing goods into the Lakes' communities and taking their exports back out to world markets? And I think it's

important for our regulators to have an understanding of what the benefits are of the ocean shipping, given what we know about the costs...the damages from invasive species.

So we undertook a study to look at what are the benefits from the ocean shipping. And I can report tonight that our, I believe, fairly comprehensive study of those benefits has found that the total annual benefit in transportation cost savings to industry from ocean shipping coming into the Great Lakes is approximately \$55 million U.S. per year.

That is benefit to both the U.S. economy and to the Canadian economy, specifically in terms of the benefit to manufacturers and retailers and the like in lower transportation costs.

Now most people are surprised by how small that number is, because in the big picture of transportation costs...for instance, the United States freight transportation costs are about \$600 billion a year.

So it's important to put that number into a little bit of context, \$55 million a year in benefit to U.S. and Canadian companies. Most people see ships on the Great Lakes and they assume probably that many of them are ocean ships, and I'm focusing on ocean ships because it's the ocean ships that bring invasive species.

The laker ships that stay within the Great Lakes or don't leave North American shores are not really the culprit when it comes to invasive species, so it's important to focus on the ocean ships.

And what we have found is that the ocean shipping is only about 6.9 per cent of the total tonnage moving on the Great Lakes in a given year. Ninety-three per cent of the tonnage is on lakers. Most of the tonnage on the Lakes is, for instance, iron ore coming from the north, coming down to Hamilton or going to Chicago or to Detroit. Those ships really aren't a factor in invasive species.

Ocean ships are primarily bringing steel into the Lakes communities from overseas, imported steel, and they are taking grain out. The grain out, if you look at all of the Canadian and U.S. grain exports, only about 3.5 per cent of U.S. grain exports move out through the Lakes, and a bigger percentage, more in the vicinity of 10 per cent of Canadian grain moves out via the Lakes on ocean ships. So most of the grain moves by alternative means.

The \$55 million benefit, if you were to go back over time, the volume of ocean shipping on the Great Lakes has been going down. Since the Seaway, the modern Seaway was built in the late 50s, the amount of tonnage, the number of ships coming and going has declined over time on a pretty steady trend line, to the point now where we're down to about 550, something like that, ships per year approximately coming in, transits in, and then going back out, a relatively small number.

So as you consider the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, I would urge that there be careful consideration to the invasive species issue and what can be done to control additional introduction of invasive species. The scientists have

indicated that there is an invasive species a year approximately being introduced into the Lakes, in terms of new species.

We really have to look very carefully at additional control measures on the ocean shipping. Now that may involve ballast water treatment. That does not deal, however, with ship...hull fouling that can result in invasives coming in.

There are a number of measures that can be taken. I believe, if the ocean carrier industry was subjected to the kinds of finds, for instance, that they are currently liable for in the case of bilge water discharge, oily bilge water discharge - the fines, in many cases, are in the hundreds of thousands of dollars – if there were similar fines in place for ballast water discharge of invasive species, the economics of bringing goods into and out of the Lakes via ocean shipping would change quite considerably.

There is just a very, very marginal benefit for most companies in using ocean shipping into the Lakes. So market forces might very well result in most ocean shipping into the Lakes ending if the industry was liable for any damages resulting from those invasives.

If they were, you know, subject to fines for biological pollutants, there's a good chance that much of the ocean shipping would end.

As a final resort, I think it's worth regulators looking at the question of whether it makes sense to continue to have ocean shipping coming into the Lakes. Is the benefit of ocean shipping in the Lakes worth the cost?

And I think that needs to be looked at quite carefully. Our study suggests \$55 million in transportation cost savings. Is that enough savings to justify bringing ocean ships and invasive species into the largest body of freshwater in the world?

So that's what I would like to suggest tonight, that there needs to be a very careful look at that as water quality issues are considered. Thanks for the time tonight.

HERB GRAY: Well, thank you. I think we should have referred to you initially as Professor Taylor, and we appreciate you coming here and giving us your very interesting views. Sorry, Professor Taylor, I think somebody...

DENNIS SCHORNACK: I'd like to ask a question, if I might...

HERB GRAY: ...wants to ask you a question, somebody I think you've met before...

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Dr. Taylor, I just want to be clear on what you have said with this \$55 million number. That would be the savings of using the Seaway and shipping lanes as opposed to using alternative means of transportations like truck, rail, and other means? Is that what I'm hearing you say?

JOHN TAYLOR: Right. About 70 per cent of the cargo moving on ocean ships is steel in and grain out. And if the steel didn't come in on ocean ships, it would come in the way most steel already comes into the U.S. and Canada, which

is that it comes to ocean ports on the coast and it's transferred to rail for the most part and moved by rail inland.

There would be a little bit of additional cost...part of that...in other words, it would cost about 55 million more if these goods could not move on ocean ships, most of that on the steel coming in.

There would be additional transportation costs, but that's a fairly small number. That 55 million would be about a 5 per cent increase in transportation costs. Now some of that would move by truck from the coastal ports to nearby cities that are closer to the East coast.

The grain going out, most of the grain already today moves either by...the U.S. grain moves primarily south via the Mississippi River. So we're suggesting if it didn't move on ocean ships, it would move down to the Gulf via the Mississippi either on barge or directly to the Gulf ports by rail.

Much of the grain today moves out of the Lakes on lakers; in other words, it's picked up in Duluth – this would be true of both Canadian and U.S. grain – it moves out of Thunder Bay and Duluth on laker vessels that never leave the North American continent and therefore do not get involved in invasive species.

Most of the grain today moves on lakers to Montreal or Quebec City, for instance, and there it's transferred to ocean ships. So if ocean ships no longer came to Duluth and Thunder Bay, more of that grain would move on lakers, with domestic crews, incidentally, on Canadian-owned ships, through the Seaway to Montreal and Quebec for transfer.

Some of that Canadian grain would also move by rail to the Montreal, Quebec City, and further down the St. Lawrence grain terminals.

The net result of all of that would be about a \$55 million cost penalty, which is a reasonably small number in the big picture of transportation costs.

So conversely, you could say the benefit of the ocean ships coming in and going out is about \$55 million a year.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Thank you.

HERB GRAY: Thank you for your further comments. I'd now like to call to the table Dean Jacobs...(APPLAUSE)...representing the Walpole Island First Nation.

DEAN JACOBS (Walpole Island First Nation): Good evening, commissioners and public. I was very pleased to hear tonight in your introductory remarks that there will be a process to seek the input from First Nations and tribal authorities, and my question is do you have any further details on that consultation process?

HERB GRAY: Mr. Jacobs, I am sorry, I don't have further information. The governments have told us they plan direct consultations with First Nations. Whether it would be done on a regional basis or through organizations of chiefs, I can't say at this time, but I'll make sure that you and your colleagues get that information as quickly as possible. I'd like to ask Chair Schornack if he has anything to add on that score.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: I have really nothing to add other than the fact that we have heard from the two governments of their intent to conduct negotiations and consultations with First Nations and tribes on a government-to-government basis.

That's the only thing we have heard. We do not know what form that will take. But you can be assured that we will forward your concerns to them in that regard.

HERB GRAY: We know of your longstanding work in the field on behalf of your First Nation and the region, so we're delighted that you chose to come to this meeting, and I know you'll want to participate in the government-to-government ones.

And we will make sure that we indicate to our contacts in Environment Canada and the Foreign Affairs Department and American equivalents that it's not enough for us to tell you that the governments want to do this, but to give you some details.

DEAN JACOBS: Thank you. I'd like to then give you some general, preliminary comments from our perspective, from the Walpole Island First Nation.

And let me first say that I don't view this as adequate or proper consultation, but I would like to take the opportunity tonight to tell you a little bit about our First Nation and also then get back to the consultation process that I

would volunteer to assist the governments that have appointed or created the International Joint Commission to do proper consultation with First Nations.

And I might add that in the spirit of the International Joint Commission, I think there may be a role for the IJC, who will be doing consultation, as I understand it, on each side of this imaginary line out in that river, and I would think that the International Joint Commission might be able to facilitate our tribal authorities on the U.S. side and First Nations on the Canadian side of coming together to share the views instead of having separate processes.

So I think the IJC might have a role in facilitating that process. If you have any views or comment on that suggestion...

HERB GRAY: Well, we'd be happy to take that aboard and discuss it with our colleagues. We certainly, as you know, have a policy of working with First Nations in our control activities, as at the Sault, for example.

We are very much aware, because of your location, your experience and sensitivity to these issues, and we should take that aboard as well, I think. Don't you agree, Chairman Schornack?

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Yes, Sir.

DEAN JACOBS: And thank you for bringing those points up. And I'd like to add that some of the issues that we will be bringing forward...and again, this isn't, in my view, consultation, but it is general comments about the issue of ownership.

The issue of ownership is still unresolved in the Great Lakes. As you know, our First Nation has launched a major court case concerning the ownership of the beds of waters of the Great Lakes. We did so on April 26th, 2000. We're working our way very slowly towards a trial.

We have successfully defended the defendants Ontario and Canada's attempts to deny us our day in court, and the courts have said that we have merit and we should have our day in court.

So we are proceeding to trial. And what we are seeking in the Ontario Superior Courts is a declaration of our aboriginal title to the lands that have never been covered by a treaty, and that includes parts of Lake Erie, half of the Detroit River, half of Lake St. Clair, islands in those bodies of water, half of the St. Clair River, and a portion of Lake Huron.

So I just wanted to let you know that an aboriginal right issue needs to be addressed through these consultations, and in our case it would be an aboriginal title.

A little bit about Walpole Island. As you were suggesting, we are indicators because we still rely on hunting, fishing, and trapping through traditional economies as our major income.

That's our number one industry. We still practice that, we have done so for thousands of years. I think it's pretty remarkable, when you look out the window, we're surrounded by urban sprawl, yet we can still practice traditional economies.

Of course, today it's rolled into modern industries of recreation and tourism, but it's still our number one industry, it's a multi-million-dollar industry. So we're very concerned about the water quality because we know that there is contamination in the river system and we're concerned about the biomagnification and the bioaccumulation.

There's western scientists that could tell us about the contamination, but there's no western scientist yet to tell us if there is a link between the contamination and the sediments in the river and the water that we drink and the water that the fish and the game use, if there is a connection to our human health.

So we're very concerned about finding out what the health effects are. As I suggested, we are indicators of the well-being of the Great Lakes. So it's larger issues.

To put it in context, there's aboriginal rights issues, ownership issues for us, the water quality issues, and the landscape politically has changed since the Water Quality Agreement was established.

In fact, very recently, a Supreme Court decision in Canada recognizing that the Crown has a duty to consult with the First Nations. And it goes beyond that, it goes to the duty to accommodate.

And I'd like to think in the future that we can achieve the duty to not only accommodate, but also to seek equity. So I'm not suggesting that this process is going to lead us to equity, but I am suggesting that we have to be equal partners

in this process, and I'd suggest that you have a role in bringing tribal authorities and First Nations together in this process.

HERB GRAY: Thank you very much. And we will get you more information about what the governments intend to do, and we'll take aboard your suggestion that we have our own ongoing relationship with First Nations and their chiefs in the area in which we work.

DEAN JACOBS: I am here to help.

HERB GRAY: Thank you. (APPLAUSE) I now want to call Cliff Misen (?) to the table, if he is present. And he'll be followed by Christina Lord. Should I say Dr. Misen?

CHRISTINA LORD: (inaudible).

HERB GRAY: Okay, I'm just alerting you.

UNIDENTIFIED: Oh, thank you.

HERB GRAY: We want to hear from Mr. Misen first.

CLIFF MISEN: In addition to quality, my concern tonight is quantity. And like the handout here tonight about the greatest freshwater resource of the world, what are we doing with it?

UNIDENTIFIED: Can you speak into the mic, please?

CLIFF MISEN: The last time I attended an IJC meeting...

HERB GRAY: Pick up that small mic.

CLIFF MISEN: Pardon?

HERB GRAY: I think it works better.

CLIFF MISEN: Okay.

HERB GRAY: How is that, everybody?

CLIFF MISEN: Should I start again?

HERB GRAY: Can we hear Mr. Misen? Okay.

CLIFF MISEN: In addition to quality, my concern tonight is quantity. And like the handout here tonight about the greatest freshwater resource in the world, what are we doing with it?

The last time I attended an IJC meeting was 12 years ago here in Windsor, and the main topic at that time was the 1986 high water levels of the Great Lakes. The Commissioner at that time was an appointee from Three Rivers, Quebec, with its own political agenda, which was contrary to lakeshore owners.

It is ironical, but as a lakeshore owner, my concerns today is the low water level of Lake Erie. Its present level, 173.97, is approximately one or more litres lower than it was in 1997.

At Long Point Beach, we have acquired another 50 yards at least of beach since 1986. Since we have to provide our own water supply on Long Point, many have had to install new water points because of the low water levels.

I have reviewed the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, the Biennial Great Lakes Water Quality Report of 2002, the Protection of the Waters of the Great Lakes Final Report 2000, which includes the Great Lakes Charter of 1985.

All of these documents have provisions to protect the quality and the quantity of the Lakes water, which is inextricable (?) to each other, as human consumption must receive priority above all other uses.

Accordingly, water resources will not be allowed to be used if it adversely affects lake levels. It further provides notification of (?) consent from all provinces and states if average use is 5,000,000 gallons per day in a 30-day period.

However, the Union Water System Leamington supplies the greenhouse industries, hydroponics, of Essex County with 11,000,000 gallons of Erie water per day, and planned expansion to 25,000,000 gallons a day.

I suggest this is contrary and a violation of all of the above documents and would appreciate an explanation of what we may do about this. Thank you very much.

HERB GRAY: Thank you. I might say, on a personal note, I am delighted to see you. I think we've exchanged many...over the years, when I was in Parliament here, I think we exchanged many letters and discussions, and I remember your concern about high water levels at that time.

CLIFF MISEN: I think I was...I initiated you into the Great Lakes system.

HERB GRAY: Well, maybe Lake Erie. Don't forget I grew up on Lake St. Clair - Chairman Schornack and I have been trying to make that another Great Lake, but we're not sure what the outcome will be.

But I do want to say that this review – and Chairman Schornack may want to comment on this – is specifically about quality, because that’s what the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement is about. And clause, I think, 7 says the two governments have to...

CLIFF MISEN: But they’re both linked. Quantity and quality are both linked.

HERB GRAY: Well, I was going to get to that point. Certainly, in times of low water, maybe some dangerous biota get more concentrated and so on. And so we understand the point, and your comments will obviously be brought to the attention of the governments and your recommendation that they take into account the quantity issue. Would you like to say something about this? You don’t have to. (LAUGHS)

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Is it Dr. Misen?

CLIFF MISEN: Pardon?

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Is it Dr. Misen or Cliff Misen?

CLIFF MISEN: Yeah.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: You mentioned a use of water for irrigation that was 11,000,000 gallons per day and then you referenced the 5,000,000 gallon per day threshold for government to...

CLIFF MISEN: Yeah.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: ...notify each other that that was going to occur. Eleven million gallons per day irrigated...sprayed onto crops or...

CLIFF MISEN: Well, this is not irrigation. This grows into greenhouses, hydroponics. It's not returned to the Great Lakes, it's not returned to the water levels.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: No, but there is only a certain percentage of that water that is actually consumed in the hydroponic growing of plants, and it's that percentage that's consumed, that if that exceeds 5,000,000 per day, then it is the obligation...if this occurs in Ontario, that would be the obligation under the Great Lakes Charter for Ontario to notify other states in the U.S. and the province of Quebec that that was going to occur. It is not...

(TAPE CHANGES SIDES)

CLIFF MISEN: ...water on this side, how many other places it's being used, and there doesn't seem to be any controls since they plan to expand to double practically what they're already using in the next few years. So it doesn't make sense. Thank you very much.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Okay. I appreciate those comments.

HERB GRAY: Thank you for coming, Dr. Misen. And I'd like Christina Lord to come forward. I might say, this is the last form that I have from people saying they'd like to speak at the microphone, but we have time to hear more.

And if there is anybody in the audience that has been inspired by the presentations and wants to come forward and make comments, we have plenty of time, we'd be delighted to hear from you. You could fill in a form or just rush up to the front, after Mrs. Lord speaks, of course.

CHRISTINA LORD: Good evening, everybody. If you noticed, (inaudible)...about whether I was going to speak (inaudible)...

HERB GRAY: Could you hold this up?

CHRISTINA LORD: (inaudible)...because I have no experience in (inaudible)...I put a question mark as to whether I was going to speak or not because I have no experience in public speaking and I'm not a scientist, I have no university degrees, so I didn't think, you know, I'd have the nerve to do this, but here I am, so I'd better get over it.

Now I wrote a letter, sent it to Ottawa, to the members of the International Joint Commission last year. It's a fairly short letter and I'd like to read it because I think it's quite relevant to water quality. And the letter was dated June 24th, 2004, and it's addressed to the distinguished members of the International Joint Commission:

I am going to keep this letter on the short side as I know that you are very busy people. I am very concerned over the environment in general, especially the transboundary concerns here in Windsor.

Firstly, I have obtained the most recent water report and I have included it with this letter. I also have included some very relevant pages from a copy 1989 of an issue of Canadian Geographic, clippings from a recent issue of the Windsor Star, a local newspaper, and a clipping from The Lance (?), the newspaper issued at the University of Windsor.

Now I telephoned Mr. Miller at the Windsor Water Treatment Plant and he sent me two reports: Section 2, Annual Report...number two, sorry, Drinking Water Surveillance Program Summary Report for 2000, 2001, and 2002.

I sent this total water report up to the International Joint Commission in Ottawa, and I don't have a whole copy of it, but I do have two cards (?) of it copies here which I am going to read from because I think it is very relevant for water quality.

I was told that our water used to be checked quarterly. That no longer happens. I was told that when I phoned the Water Commission.

As you will be able to see when the reports are read, many pesticides and chemicals are present in our drinking water, but my main focus today is deadly, highly toxic organic methylmercury.

In the 1989 magazine article I have enclosed, you will see the correlation between the reproductive symptoms and deaths of thousands of birds, specifically loons, and the high content of this deadly organic methylmercury in the bodies of these birds. The birds indeed had a very high content in their bodies when testing was done by scientists.

The Windsor Star article I have also enclosed speaks specifically about reproductive disruptions in the bodies of male snapping turtles recently tested. These turtles lived in the St. Clair River, the Detroit River, and Wheatley Harbour.

After reading this article, I remembered the Canadian Geographic clippings from 1989 and dug them out and noticed a definite correlation between the loons and the turtles.

In the Windsor Star article, it says that the final report on the snapping turtles is due to be completed and presented to a conference in Oregon in November.

I personally believe that organic methylmercury is a leading cause of the illnesses and symptoms of these species, which is important because they're swimming around in the water we drink.

Back to the water reports. I checked to see the content of inorganic mercury, which is supposed to be relatively harmless. It is a rather heavy metal which can occur naturally and can be part of factory waste.

Now, accordingly, after checking the mercury content under the title inorganic testing – that's the Windsor water report, okay – under the title inorganic testing, I found mercury content was listed. Okay, fair enough.

To my amazement and concern, when I checked the section to see the content of organic mercury, which is, as I've read, organic mercury is a type...well, there are two types.

Organic mercury evolves over decades from inorganic, which is a heavy mercury which sinks to the bottom of the river or wherever, and it's the organic one which is the dangerous one, okay.

Now, the Windsor report stated the amount of the inorganic, which is supposed to be a harmless-type mercury. When I checked to see the content of organic mercury, it was not there.

I must reach the conclusion therefore that only inorganic mercury is being tested for in the Windsor bio water commission here, which is very worrying. They're two different and separate, distinct types of mercury.

Inorganic mercury is not found in fishes or turtles. Only organic mercury is found in fishes and turtles, and that's the organic methylmercury which evolves from inorganic. This is the deadly one, okay.

And I put there...okay...over decades, inorganic mercury is changed into deadly organic methylmercury by sulphate-producing bacteria. This takes...I'm not a scientist, I read this mostly from the National Geographic.

Why is our mercury testing confined to only one of the two types of mercury? It would be interesting to see if the water commission in Detroit checks for organic mercury or only the supposedly ineffective and harmless inorganic mercury.

This is rather disconcerting, to say the least. If you check the drinking water systems regulation, section 10 (?) in your report, under organic section, there is no sign of testing for organic mercury. I hope I'm not repeating myself here.

I have discussed these concerns with the good office of Local 444 CAW Windsor. It was their suggestion that I should contact you and send this letter up to the International Joint Commission in Ottawa, which I did by special delivery.

I was a bit disappointed I didn't get a « thanks for your letter » back, but anyway, I hope you got it, Mr. Gray. Did you get my letter? Did you receive this letter I sent last year? I never had a "I received your letter" or anything from the International Joint Commission that you had received this letter.

So I can't assume...because I'm not a scientist, that perhaps there was a reason it wasn't acknowledged?

HERB GRAY: (inaudible)...give a try at answering that one.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: I don't know if we received it.

CHRISTINA LORD: Okay. Well, Mr. Gray, I sent this letter up to the International Joint Commission in Ottawa. I never had a...it was sent out by special delivery.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Excuse me.

CHRISTINA LORD: Okay.

HERB GRAY: I don't recall a letter from you...

CHRISTINA LORD: Don't you? I sent it by good Canada Post, tracked...you must have received it, Mr. Gray. But anyway, I'm reading it now, so...

HERB GRAY: I have to apologize, my hearing isn't as good as it should be, and the sound system distorts your voice at this end, so it's hard for me to...

CHRISTINA LORD: Oh, sorry, am I...okay, I'm sorry. Can you hear me quite clearly or...?

HERB GRAY: Well, I'd like to ask...is Dr. Clamen here? Can you help us answer this lady's question about her letter? I don't recall a letter from her coming forward, we try to...

CHRISTINA LORD: Yeah, I sent newspaper cuttings, newspaper cuttings...

UNIDENTIFIED: (inaudible)...

CHRISTINA LORD: Because I was disappointed I didn't get an acknowledgement. I've been drinking this water, I've been in Windsor since 82, been in Canada since 76, I've been drinking this water for a long time. And I would have appreciated...I understand you're very busy people, but I would have appreciated a thank you for your concern. Okay, fine.

It was (inaudible) that I should contact you, that was from Local 444. I will now mention briefly the clippings from the University of Windsor newspaper, The Lance, dated January 22nd, 2002.

In this article, you will see the devastating effect chemicals in the environment are having upon humans, and it should be a top priority to implement and enforce detailed and vigorous water testing on a much more frequent basis than is presently being done, especially making sure that specific testing is targeted, making sure that, for example, both types of mercury are being tested for, not just one type, the heavy inorganic mercury.

We need testing for organic mercury, which, as I said, that's the mercury that's poisoning people, poisoning fishes, poisoning First Nations communities in the north, methylmercury. We need something done about that.

Okay, deadly chromium is also being tested in a general manner. Now I was told when I phoned the water commission that mercury is tested on a general basis.

Well, I'm not a scientist, but in the water report it said specifically inorganic testing, organic testing. And I look through tonight, they are separate chemicals. You are not getting one chemical tested under both types of testing. So I have to draw the conclusion that testing for mercury is not being done. And if that's a fact, that is an absolute disgrace.

The people are drinking this water, people are fishing down by the river, Health Canada has made statements that people should not...should be very careful, I believe pregnant women and children should be very careful how much of this fish they eat.

And every summer, I am walking down by the river and I am seeing families fish and I am speaking to them, they're telling me we take this fish home and we're eating it.

Why are there no signs by the river warning pregnant women not to eat this fish, students who don't have much money not to eat this fish? I mean, it's very, very sloppy monitoring of people's safety here.

Okay, now let's have a look, what did I get to...deadly chromium, fine, okay. Deadly chromium is also being tested in a general manner, I was told, which in fact...when in fact one type of chromium is deadly and causes reproductive disruptions...that was...I don't know whether you saw the film with Julia Roberts...oh God...

UNIDENTIFIED: (inaudible).

CHRISTINA LORD: Yes, fine, thank you. The company that was poisoning the people was saying it was a certain type of chromium that they were finding in the water and people were assuming, oh well, they're testing for chromium, the chromium's fine, it's not the chromium poisoning people.

But when she checked very carefully, the type of chromium which is poisoning people wasn't being checked for in the water system, so she won a huge settlement for people.

The same thing...I would like the International Joint Committee (sic), I am asking, please check to make sure that organic mercury is being tested for, because certainly by everything I've seen, it's not.

Okay, in The Lance article, you will see...now this is absolutely...I went when I read this, it's just appalling. In this Lance article, you will see a 200 per cent higher incidence of babies being born without brains...that's a 200 per cent higher incidence of babies being...I'm not a scientist, I just read this. I looked at this article, I looked at that article, I thought, oh my God, what's going on here, being born without brains?

We also have a deadly rate of...it's female babies mostly, for some reason, I have no idea why. We also have a deadly rate of cancer. Please keep in mind other forms of pollution are taking place.

Now I'm talking... mining really doesn't concern this area, but it's a transboundary issue. Over decades, mining companies were allowed to bankrupt and were not made to clean up the toxic mess they left behind in the abandoned mines.

These chemicals are polluting the lakes and streams of Canada. You know, the tourist industry says, oh, come and visit our beautiful lakes and streams in northern Ontario and bla bla bla bla bla, turning a blind eye that First Nations people are being poisoned by mercury in fish, chemicals leaching from old mines that nobody gives a damn to fix it.

And also, another important issue which is a transboundary issue is lead. We have thousands and thousands of hunters going up north, and fine, hunting, that's a tradition in many people.

But what I am suggesting is perhaps the International Joint Committee (sic) can do something about the lead shot. Lead shot, I read the other day that there are thousands of pounds...can you hear me, Mr. Gray? Can you hear me? Is there an echo?

There are thousands of pounds, perhaps millions of pounds from decades and decades and decades of hunting with lead shot. And this lead shot is coating

the bottom of our beautiful lakes in Ontario. Again, First Nations people are being poisoned.

Whether the lead is leaching from the sediment into fish, I don't know, I'm not a scientist. But I think certainly reasonable consideration should be given to banning lead shot the same way Lady Diana managed to banish mines.

I think we've got a lot of little tiny billions and billions of little mines lying on the bottom of our pristine lakes that aren't so pristine when you really look at what's lying on the bottom of those lakes.

I mean, you can shovel it up, by this article that I read, you could shovel up the lead shot. This has been going on since...for a hundred years. So I think that really needs to be addressed because that is a very serious transboundary issue, lead shot.

I'm going back to (inaudible) now...think of how this is affecting the First Nations people, as a totally disrespectful way to treat them. And let us not forget chemical contamination that's been found in the far reaches of the north, affecting the fish and birds of those regions.

And not so much the north...I read the other day, in the North Pacific, albatross...there are billions and billions of pounds of plastic getting into our oceans, and there's a very large island called the Midway Atoll in the North Pacific where these albatross birds are trying to breed and they're trying to feed their young and they're gagging, they're dying on the plastic.

And also, it's been found, in looking at the flesh of the albatross, that the albatross contain just as much pollutants in their bodies as the bald eagle of the Great Lakes has been found.

So this pollution is travelling all over the place. When you think about it, the same level of mercury, the same level of toxins is found in the flesh of the albatross in the Northern Pacific as found in the flesh of the bald eagle of the Great Lakes region, and that's very serious.

One more issue affecting our drinking water is lead shot...I've already gone into that, bore everybody to death, okay, fine.

Our world has become a place where our water and natural resources are not being treated with the reverence and respect they deserve. We are not the owners of this planet, we are the children of it, as First Nations people keep saying and which is being ignored by government.

Federal government after federal government, provincial government after provincial government, is conveniently turning their back on the concerns of First Nations people, and it's not acceptable.

We are not the owners of this planet, we are the children of it, and respect must be restored for our survival, and deepest survival of the human race depends on it.

Now this beautiful and sacred planet is our final frontier, it really is. This sounds very trite, this sounds very...I'm not trying to be dramatic, but this is our final frontier. This is a tiny planet.

Corporations must be brought under control. Polluting must be brought under control. Governments have to take a far more responsible view with polluting.

And I'm going to...I don't know how long this is taking, I don't want to let it go into too long, but I just want to read this final paragraph, and I have just a couple of newspaper clippings to read very quickly.

But let it now become our final resting place, a giant burial ground for future generations. Now this could happen. Our grandchildren could spend their lives in doctor's offices with all sorts of DNA problems in their genes...

I just read about 200 per cent higher instance of female babies being born without brains in this area. That's higher than Hamilton, much higher than Hamilton. It's one of the highest incidences of babies being born without brains in the world.

That's very serious, and we're drinking this water. I use a Brita filter, but lately I've been looking at my Brita filter and thinking I don't think this is doing very much good.

So I think the water commission here in Windsor needs contacting to make sure. And I have, Mr. Gray, and Sir – I didn't catch your name, I'm so sorry, I apologize...

DENNIS SCHORNACK: It's Dennis Schornack.

CHRISTINA LORD: Schornack. Yes, Mr. Schornack, sorry, I apologize. I do have the drinking water systems regulation, I do have the specific parts I've

photocopied which show for a fact that our water...the methylmercury is not being tested in our system. I have it here, okay, fine.

Now let me just look through this. Now, Canada's coastal cities are big polluters. Now I find this...I read this article and I find this so appalling, that it is just...this article was written not long ago, I don't have a date on it, but it was written not long ago. Now this is titled Canada's Coastal Cities Big Polluters. Billions of litres of raw, smelly sewage. What monitoring is being done of our sewage here?

The lady who was here said she noticed soap and foaming in the water. Remember she said she saw soap and foaming in the water? So perhaps that foaming is from untreated sewage, so maybe we should look into that a little more.

With treated sewage, you should not be seeing...and I've actually looked over the rail down at the park and I've seen a lot of soapy, foaming water, and that's not acceptable.

Now, Canada's coastal cities rank among the world's worst offenders when it comes to spewing billions of litres of dirty, stinking, and dangerous untreated sewage into open waters, says a report released Wednesday by environmental groups.

Victoria, Montreal, St. John, Halifax, Charlottetown, St. John's, continue to use their surrounding waters as large toilet bowls to discharge their filth,

human waste and toxic chemical cocktails with little or no sewage treatment, says a report which graded 22 cities across Canada.

The report was compiled by the Sierra League Defence Fund on behalf of the Georgia Strait Alliance, the Labour Environmental Alliance Society and the T. Buck Suzuki Foundation.

Calgary, Edmonton, and Whistler were issued top marks, bla bla bla, that's good. Quebec City, Ottawa, Winnipeg, Hamilton, Toronto, and Brampton were among other Canadian cities that received improved grades for major improvements to their sewage treatment systems over the past few years.

Now I'm asking, on behalf of everybody here, that we get a report on the last time the sewage system in Windsor and Detroit was upgraded. I think we're entitled to that, we have to drink this water.

Okay, the casual assumption that whatever we pour down the drain and flush down the toilet is suitably treated before being released into our environment is false, the report said, adding many of Canada's sewage systems are dumping grounds for a manner of waste and must be cleared up.

And...I'm just appalled, absolutely appalled reading this. An Environment Canada spokesman said Ottawa and the provinces are working toward developing a joint wastewater treatment program by 2006. Okay, so how much closer are we with that, Mr. Gray?

HERB GRAY: Sorry, I can't...

CHRISTINA LORD: An Environment Canada spokesperson...I don't know when people should learn how to use a speech which is not political.

HERB GRAY: Excuse me, while I said we have plenty of time, our time is limited and we have several other speakers...

CHRISTINA LORD: Okay, well, all right, fine...how long have I been speaking? Do you know?

UNIDENTIFIED: (inaudible)...

HERB GRAY: And I do want to apologize.

CHRISTINA LORD: I think I brought up some very relevant points...

HERB GRAY: I find that the sound coming towards me is very distorted and I may not be grasping all of the points.

CHRISTINA LORD: Okay, okay, can you hear me clearly? Are you able to hear me clearly? The lady nodding back there, okay, fine. There's just one more thing I want to mention and I'll make it very brief, Mr. Gray, this is very important...

HERB GRAY: Excuse me, I wanted to observe, you were talking about the sewage problems in Halifax and so on, which are certain (inaudible)...

CHRISTINA LORD: No, it's been (inaudible) a lot of cities, Mr. Gray.

HERB GRAY: Yes, but we're dealing here with the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, the Agreement pertaining to the Great Lakes.

CHRISTINA LORD: Yeah.

HERB GRAY: So we have an interest in all of these subjects...

CHRISTINA LORD: Definitely.

HERB GRAY: But this meeting is called to receive views we can pass on to the Canadian and American governments in their review of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement...

CHRISTINA LORD: Well, I think, with all due respect to you, Sir, I think I have made some very good points. Now, finally, I would just want to make a point about the corporate feeding lots for animals, agriculture animals. I believe there are some in Michigan and I know there are some in Alberta, but I don't know about Ontario.

Now these animals are being fed Revela H (?), it's endometrioid (?), it's a growth hormone. Okay, they are also pumped full of antibiotics, okay...this is a transboundary issue, Mr. Gray, for the simple reason, when you see millions and millions and millions of animals kept out in crawl feed lots, you know, this is going on across North America, and the beef actually is banned in Europe and England because of the Revela H, the estradiol, the growth hormone for these animals, because they don't develop properly because of the way they're kept.

Their feces leak into groundwater, which leaks into rivers, which leaks into oceans, which is causing massive algae bloom in our oceans. This is a trans...you just said, it should be issues that are transboundary.

With all due respect to you, Sir, this is very important pollution, whether it's from agricultural corporate farming, whether it's from inadequately testing

municipal water, as in our case. I am very doubtful that the water is not being tested properly.

And according to what I was told at the water commission, it used to be, before Mr. Harris' government arrived, it used to be tested on a quarterly basis for chemicals and quality.

Now I've been told that the water commission only checks the quality of the water and the chemicals in it, I think it's every six months to a year. That's a completely unacceptable. And on that happy note, I'll end, give somebody else a chance. (APPLAUSE)

HERB GRAY: Okay, well, we'd like to thank you for your comments, which have covered a...

CHRISTINA LORD: I hope that none of it was irrelevant and I hope I haven't bored you, Mr. Gray.

HERB GRAY: I just want to observe that the last speaker has raised a lot of very important issues going far beyond the Great Lakes and that we certainly take note of them, and we appreciate the comments.

And I also want to add that we have commented in the past on the issue of advisories about what fish to eat on the basis of testing showing accumulation of mercury...

CHRISTINA LORD: Yes, Health Canada states quite clearly that pregnant women and young children should not be eating fish that's under advisory. Fish in the Detroit River is under an advisory, a Health Canada

advisory. There are people fishing down there, pregnant women, and I spoke to a pregnant woman a few months ago, she said she eats the fish. There are no signs advising people of the mercury content.

UNIDENTIFIED: (inaudible)...

CHRISTINA LORD: Where? Where are the signs?

UNIDENTIFIED: (inaudible)...

CHRISTINA LORD: Yeah, well, bake shops and Canadian Tire...I'm talking about signs that are down by the river because I'm speaking to a lot of people who have just come to Windsor. They made not even have heard of Canadian Tire, you know.

UNIDENTIFIED: (inaudible)...

CHRISTINA LORD: Well, they may not even be able to read English, but they do understand that they can pick up a fishing line, they're hungry, perhaps some people are new to Windsor, and they may want to go and fish and be able to know that the fish is safe to eat.

And I was absolutely appalled that this pregnant woman had been eating fish from the river regularly, three times a week for a year. So I certainly hope her baby was all right. Something needs to be done about this, you know.

We have endless commissions, endless commissions. I mean, we need to have the water checked properly more than once a year, more than every six months.

HERB GRAY: The International Joint Commission doesn't...the International Joint Commission itself doesn't do testing, but we will make sure...your comments are obviously being recorded and will be brought to the attention...

(VOICES OVERLAP)

CHRISTINA LORD: Thank you. Thank you, Sir, I appreciate it. Thank you, Sir. I appreciate it.

HERB GRAY: (inaudible)...and I think Chairman Schornack wants to add...

CHRISTINA LORD: Okay.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: I have nothing to add except to say that we need to provide the courtesy to some of the other speakers who are waiting to speak. So please, thank you for your comments...

CHRISTINA LORD: But the thing is, I haven't been here that long, I certainly haven't, and I think what I have had to say has been very relevant. And on that happy note, I'll sit down.

HERB GRAY: Is Rachel Renaud here?

RACHEL RENAUD: There's no button? Is it on?

DENNIS SCHORNACK: I think it's working.

RACHEL RENAUD: It's on? Oh...

DENNIS SCHORNACK: There you go.

RACHEL RENAUD: We're live, okay. Mr. Gray, Mr. Stronach (sic), I attended les audiences publiques in Montreal, and I happen...I'm a Windsor native and I have been invited to BookFest Windsor this coming weekend as a French-speaking author, so I was really pleased to be able to catch this meeting as well and to hear my co-citizens talk about local concerns.

I am an Essex County native, and I would like to thank two people in particular for their input this evening: Mr. Taylor, who is a transport logistics expert in regard to invasive species.

It saddens me deeply that there are one, if not two on average invasive species who move into our Great Lakes system and change its dynamic dramatically.

And I really feel...I know that a lot of work has been done and I haven't read all of the reports on this, but in the Guide, on page 19, it's the last line, in regard to ballast water control, it says the lack of common regulations in the two countries has slowed progress.

I remember reading about this some five years ago, so this is the U.S. and...we can't get our act together, the U.S. and Canada. So it's not dealing with the particular country where the ship comes from, it's U.S. and Canada.

Are the two of you optimistic that this différend will be resolved in the near future? Because we have to act soon.

Like, our native mussels are going to dust. And next summer, I hope to be able to work on Walpole Island, there's a project there for identification of native

species, and it sounds like I'm welcome to help out there, but I've grown very attached to our native mussels here in Lake Erie and Lake St. Clair, and I refuse to say they're gone.

So are you optimistic about this shit we're getting from this ballast, these ships? (LAUGHS) Thank you.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Is it Rachel or Rachel?

RACHEL RENAUD: Rachel, Rachel.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Rachel.

RACHEL RENAUD: Rachel, yeah.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Rachel, I'd like to report that we are optimistic, but I would have to say...

RACHEL RENAUD: You aren't? You aren't? Aren't?

DENNIS SCHORNACK: I would like to report that we are, but of course I don't see at this point in time any common standard or regulation being adopted in the immediately foreseeable future by the two countries.

This review, this agreement could serve as a vehicle for agreeing upon what that standard might be.

RACHEL RENAUD: So it could give us a lot of leverage.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: It very well could. If the two governments commit in this agreement to a common standard for ballast water discharges...

RACHEL RENAUD: Yes.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: ...then that job is done and you have then the agencies to regulate the shipping, commerce, in accord with that standard. But I have no indication that this is going to happen. It only falls, I think, to you and to others who share this concern to keep working on it.

RACHEL RENAUD: So those of us who are here present, even though we might have other specific issues, by e-mail, we should make some reference to ballast water control.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: I wouldn't stop there.

RACHEL RENAUD: Yes, you wouldn't stop there. (LAUGHS) Thank you. Yes?

HERB GRAY: Sorry, I didn't want to interrupt. I just wanted to remind everybody that although to facilitate the meeting, Chairman Schornack and I make comments, really we're supposed to be here to receive your comments...

RACHEL RENAUD: Yes. (LAUGHS)

HERB GRAY: ...and not to get involved in the discussions ourselves because this is not the purpose...

RACHEL RENAUD: Yes.

HERB GRAY: ...of these meetings around the Lakes.

RACHEL RENAUD: But I just wanted to just get a feeling, and you've given me, in all frankness, how things have to change in this regard, and I appreciate your candor.

Very briefly, I have a second comment, and I'd like to thank, I think it was Dr. Cliff Misen, from Lake Erie - from Long Point, that's Lake Erie isn't it? Oui – in regard to water quantity.

I was there sandbagging in Bell River, trying to save our family plot (?) (inaudible). I have fought the bull rushes when the water levels have gone down and I have kept my parents' beach clean. Every time I am down in the summer, I have a beach project.

So I know the water fluctuations, I have been involved up to my hips and knees in this. So there is something happening to our lakes. I have been reassured that there are no diversions down the Mississippi.

But I am very concerned that Lake Erie is being siphoned off to this extent. I was appalled to hear this this evening. Lake Erie is the shallowest of the Great Lakes. When the glaciers moved, it was the very last scoop slide.

The three basins are vulnerable. They're vulnerable for phosphorus, they've vulnerable for invasive species. The less water that is there, the worse it is going to be.

And I'm from the puddle – Lake St. Clair – you're trying to make into a Great Lake, I know that movement has been on the go for some time. It's a healthier lake.

My sister and brother-in-law said it's been about five years since they've had good fishing there, and last summer it was great and early this fall, so that's good news for Lake St. Clair.

But I really do feel that water quantity and climate change...at the end of the guide, where do we go from here? The first item is climate change, and it talks about alterations in water levels.

With global warming, there will be more evaporation, and down the road, we're going to have to be dealing with water quality if we don't have the guts or the golf balls to do it now.

But for God's sake, we can't siphon off Lake Erie. It's just so insane. So I just wanted to say that the Pelee Islands, too, the biological diversity there is exceptional.

Last summer, I visited Pelee Islands for the first time with my sister and brother-in-law and I discovered there are butterflies there that are very rare, I saw clouds of them.

And there's an earth snail that is only found in the Pelee Islands in the world – and I didn't take any live ones, but the shells were there, so I collected enough for all us on the expedition. But the Pelee Islands are the only spot in the world where these sweet little snails are.

So I just want to say, for me, water quantity, it is an issue, and really...it's up to you to help us resolve this, and we count on you. Thank you.

HERB GRAY: Thank you very much for your comments. They are very important and much related to the purpose of this meeting and others like it around the Lakes.

Now I want to say, unless Chairman Schornack wants to comment, that we have two last speakers: Don McCabe, of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, and Jeffrey Bikini (?), of Lasalle, near Windsor.

UNIDENTIFIED: (inaudible)...

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Sir, did you fill out a card?

UNIDENTIFIED: Uh, no (inaudible)...

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Please. We don't know that you want to speak if you don't fill out a card, so...

UNIDENTIFIED: (inaudible)...

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Sure. Just tell us your name and we'll write it down and you can speak as well.

HERB GRAY: Okay. Would Mr. McCabe come forward please? Now, before Mr. McCabe starts, I want to know if Dr. Vigmostad is still with us. I'd like her to stand up, and the reason I want to introduce her is she has just become the Director of the office that we oversee in Windsor, the Great Lakes Regional Office created by the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement to help us deal with Great Lakes issues.

So the treaty, the Agreement – it's really a treaty – the Agreement provides that the directors alternate, a Canadian for four years and then an American for four years, and Dr. Vigmostad has just come to us to be the Director of the Great Lakes Office that is in the Bank of Commerce building.

So I'm not going to ask you to speak – to do that, I would be breaking our rules where we say we're here to listen. But I'm sorry to interrupt, Mr. McCabe, but I didn't want the evening to proceed without you knowing that there is a new director, and I'm sure you'll hear from her, or you may have occasion to seek information and she'd be happy, with her staff, to assist.

So Mr. McCabe, we'd be delighted to hear from you now, and sorry to interrupt.

DON MCCABE: Thank you, gentlemen, and you did not interrupt...

HERB GRAY: I have a suggestion. I think at least I would hear better if people didn't hold these portable mics right up to their mouth but held it a bit back...

DON MCCABE: Right about there, is it fine for you, Sir?

HERB GRAY: Maybe a little closer...try that.

DON MCCABE: Try that?

HERB GRAY: Okay.

DON MCCABE: Okay, we'll try and keep it consistent. If I screw up, you can throw water at me. (LAUGHS)

First of all, I'd just like to thank you for the opportunity to participate this evening, and I'd also like it to be noted that my comments are not necessarily those of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, but it is an organization I'm involved with.

I am a farmer from Inwood, Ontario. And the Ontario Federation of Agriculture will be submitting a document before the end of the time frame for submissions. It was my opportunity tonight to essentially do reconnaissance.

The comments that I'd like to make are essentially dealing with your guide on pages 19 and 20, where we go from here, and I'd like to thank both countries for actually working together on a very important issue of water as a whole.

However, I'd also like to relieve or possibly alter some of the mindset, if that's possible, on the role of what agriculture has or has not done with regards to water quality.

I emphasize that I believe paper doesn't refuse ink, and newspapers have to be printed every day, and sometimes some of the facts are overshadowed by the need to pay for the advertising.

That you are looking forward to trying to link climate change with water quality, I think, is of an utmost importance. The issue that I see here is that Canada has signed a Kyoto Accord, where the U.S. has not.

But I also stress that from my perspective of following climate change policy, that the United States has not dropped the ball whatsoever in wanting to deal with that issue and how you're dealing with beneficial management practices within the watershed for agriculture in the United States.

With that said, I think it very important that any policy that comes forth, that it be understood that when I hook on a (inaudible) drill in the springtime, I use one draw bolt, and I'm going to take care of climate change, biodiversity,

sediment loading, pesticide loading, and a myriad of other environmental issues every time I make that one pass across the field.

That is why part of the phosphorus load has dropped dramatically from non-point source pollution into the lake area.

I would use as an example the South Nation watershed, which is up close to the Ontario-Québec border in the area east of Ottawa. The watershed actually dumps into this Ottawa River and eventually into the St. Lawrence.

There, there is actually a phosphorus trading program which allows the municipalities there not to have to actually increase taxes to the urban residences because they are doing a pollution swap with the agricultural commodities there, because agriculture has actually cut back its nutrient use in that area and doing more for the environment than the urban folks actually are.

We get nailed with the issues around pesticides. I would stress that DDT and PCBs are not on our list of usable products, nor have they been for at least the last 50 years. We have also decreased our use of active ingredients by 50 per cent over the last 25 years and continue to do so.

Why? That stuff costs money. I don't have it. I buy at retail, I sell at wholesale. I'm a Canadian farmer, but I sell off the Chicago Board of Trade.

I think that it's absolutely great that you folks recognize the value of the farm on the U.S. side of the border; I just wish you'd give it up for a while so that we can get back in the game. It's a transparent border here, to corn, soy beans, and wheat, and our actions are becoming detrimental to the product for all.

I would stress that Canada enjoys the cheapest food basket in the world because of the efforts of Canadian agriculture. Folks like to label us as corporate farmer. I would stress that the livestock numbers in this country have not increased; they are only in fewer hands because there is less people willing to do the work.

The only livestock that's actually increased is the number of horses. It's actually gone over the amount that we used in the timeframe of breaking the ground when we used them for work than we do now.

So that's the reason for larger farms and all the rest of it. Everybody's got to try and make a living. But the bottom line, at the end of the day, here, Sirs, the issue for me on the farm is I welcome proper regulation, but I welcome it after proper consultation and proper recognition of the work that's gone on there already.

I was or could still be a non-point source polluter in some of my issues, but I've gone above and beyond in some of the aspects of what's been done here. There is no stormwater that dumps off of agricultural land.

If I get a massive wash now because of a four-inch rain from climate change events that could possibly have happened or not, you will find that we have gone to no till (?) and therefore we don't have the phosphorus loading or sediment loading, because that's how it comes from agriculture.

If you want phosphorus, it means you're moving dirt. If I'm paying 5,000 an acre for that stuff, I don't want it going anywhere but staying in my field.

The bottom line: please keep us in mind. Please make sure climate change policy...

(TAPE CHANGES SIDES)

...and regulation isn't going to help that any more. Thank you for your time this evening.

HERB GRAY: Well, thank you for your presentation. (APPLAUSE)
And I'd now like to invite Jeffrey Bikini to come to the table. And this gentleman here, has he...have you filled in a form?

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Are you Matthew?

MATTHEW DOHERTY: Yes.

HERB GRAY: Matthew Doherty.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: You're next.

HERB GRAY: Okay, after we hear from Mr. Bikini, we'd invite Matthew Doherty of the nearby town of Tecumseh to come to the table, to the microphone.

JEFFREY BIKINI: Hello, gentlemen.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Good evening.

JEFFREY BIKINI: Basically, what I want to speak about right now is some good indicators that are successes that the IJC has applied all its work on for the last 20 or 30 years.

Some of the things in particular, because I live in the down river community, halfway between here and the mouth of Lake Erie, is that we have

been noticing a lot of predatory birds residing in the area or staying in the area through the course of the spring and summer.

We know for a fact that there's hawks...hawks are...(inaudible) saying, you know...hawks have been known and cited to be flying and landing in the trees in our neighbourhood. I live two blocks off the river, so we have hawks in the trees.

And I have personally identified a falcon which has landed in the backyard, in our garden area, and picked up a small bird to feed on. It's quite impressive to see these birds coming back into the community.

Now I know for a fact that there is some, you know, reintroduction...I don't know if reintroduction is the right word to use, but...re-entry, I guess, back into this ecosystem of bald eagles.

You know, I know that the lady who spoke about some bald eagles and some issues with them; there are successes. And if Ken Smith is here, he knows that there is a number of success stories with bald eagles pairs nesting in the entire area. Some of them are very close to where I live, and that is definitely, you know, a good indicator that things are cleaning up around here.

Sure, there's some problems that need to be addressed for the next, you know, 100 years. But you know, if you've got a pair of bald eagles nesting in a down river community, eating the fish out of the water, you know, these eagles are not eating, you know, human-delivered food to them. They're just not relying

on that, they're out there fishing on their own. You know, that's quite impressive.

So what I want to speak about is that, the success of, you know, some of these cleanup efforts, which is, you know, that we've noticed a lot of hawks, falcons, and the eagles back into the area.

Fish habitats are, you know, fairly stable in the area. The fishermen are, you know, pulling out their quotas of fish...it's just the, you know, recreational fishermen, of course, that are pulling out their quotas on a day-to-day basis out here, you know, on the river, you know.

And they're relatively clean fish, you know, you're not seeing, you know, the tumours and that on it that you would have known to have seen in the past.

What else can I talk about here...I guess as far as some of the other citings in the area would be, you know, large groups of swans which happen to be around, which is something that we haven't noticed in this region in my entire life until this past year, you know. And I see 20 or 30 of them hanging around in Lasalle, right around the little bays and coves in there, you know, it's quite impressive.

So what are some of the things to caution on that I'm aware of but I don't really know an awful lot about is the sea lamprey, you know, going into the Toledo River. If it hits the Toledo River, I don't know that corridor (?) down there in the United States, but you know, you certainly don't want that lamprey

going out into the Ohio River and, you know, entering the U.S. interior, and we don't want that expanding around here. But it's here. I don't see it, but it's here.

Water fleas, I'm not that familiar with, but I know they're out there. Zebra mussels, we really haven't heard an awful lot on lately. But one of the issues with the zebra mussels filtering out some of the contaminants in the water is that the gobe fish are eating them, and you can identify some of the contaminated gobe fish by their discolorations.

And again, those fish are...the gobes are being eaten again through the food chain by, you know, seagulls or ducks and geese and whatever, and that's where you find some of the deaths occurring in the wildlife, waterfowl.

So those are some things to be concerned about, of course. Riverbed toxins, which is something that, you know, you know they're out there. Now it's just a matter of what you guys can do to address that in the future and clean them up. It's not the easiest thing to do, but they're there.

Toxic discharges coming out of the St. Clair River, which we've had some problems with that in the last couple of years, but we haven't had any reports on it, so thanks for that.

I guess one of the other issues there is that ballast water issue, which is definitely not the easiest thing to control. But you know, my only comment to make on that is that if you can control it, it has to be controlled at the entrance of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

And the other gentleman that spoke first, I believe, about the marine traffic and the ocean-going vessels being, you know, restricted from the Great Lakes region, that's an issue all in itself and it carries a lot of economic impact, with basically creating maybe a new port out in the eastern coast and shipping things inland via land. You know, that's a pretty significant issue to take, and you know, I can't really speak much on that.

Anyways, that's pretty much it. I'm pretty happy with seeing, you know, the re-introduction of these predatory birds in the region. It's a good indicator that things are cleaning up, you know, and you guys deserve to know that. So thank you, and thanks to the Great Lakes Institute for all of the work that they have done as well.

HERB GRAY: Thank you, Mr. Bikini, for...(APPLAUSE)...your comments. I want to make a quick observation before inviting Mr. Doherty to the table, and that's the things you've talked about confirm how we're all very much part of the same ecosystem.

Air, land, water, birds, fish, and human beings, we're all linked together in the system. And at the end of the day, if we aren't careful, we're all going to sink or swim together. So I just want to make that observation that struck me listening to the range of comments of yourself and others.

So thank you very much. And Mr. Doherty, can you come forward? And we'll be delighted to hear from you.

MATTHEW DOHERTY: I figure I'll use some of this water before (inaudible)... Not to be a downer on the bald eagles, but an example of bioaccumulation is when the eagles get older, they start to turn into crazy eagles, and the way they act, it's pretty sad, actually.

Anyways, I apologize for not being prepared, I didn't know people would be able to speak tonight. I just saw it in the newspaper, so I came over.

The first thing was the transportation professor, I'm not sure if he's here anymore, but it seems in the transportation world, that the ocean-going Great Lakes freighters aren't that big of a deal, it's only \$55 million.

And with the restrictions on them exchanging ballast water and them seeming to not want to do it, if it's such a hard thing, I think maybe it's time to end the ocean-going Great Lakes freighters and ocean freight on the Great Lakes, and it would be an opportunity for our countries to increase our rail systems, to also decrease trucks, which, in Windsor, is the biggest issue right now.

And I'm willing to bet that roadway runoffs or chemicals plays a significant role in Great Lakes basin pollution.

Oh, sorry, I forgot to say good evening, Mr. Schornack and Mr. Gray.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Good evening.

MATTHEW DOHERTY: I even wrote down your names...I'm an environmental studies student at the University of Windsor and I have read an awful lot of disheartening stuff over the last three years.

Batteries, for instance...I have a package at home and it says now with no extra mercury. Why they would put extra mercury in there is beyond me.

But a big issue to me is that people do not know about things like battery recycling. Today, I was down on the river and I found a battery laying on the ground, and I often find batteries laying on the ground, I pick them up and bring them with me home.

I also found a bundle of fishing line, maybe 50 yards or so. And a number of times in my life, I've had to cut animals loose or dispose of dead ones that have been tangled in fishing line.

And it seems to me that they either don't know or people don't care, and I think people really should be made to be aware and care of things like that.

Again, on the St. Clair riverbed, recently, I can't remember exactly when, but they talked about...what's it called...the Sarnia chemical valley has turned much of that into a huge dumping ground for toxins.

And until it was found out, they never admitted it. And then, when they did, you know, they cleaned it up, but there's just no responsibility. And it's something that is just disgraceful to both countries, I think, besides the fact that we get all of the airborne pollution, or much of it, just like from the Ohio Valley – well, it depends which way the air is blowing.

And Zug Island, just over there, I remember reading it was quoted as being the most polluted square mile on Earth, which is right on the Detroit River, feeding into Lake Erie.

So I think things like that, and the Rouge River Plant, where...I have it written down here...last weekend or a couple of weekends ago, I went to Cedar Point and I felt like I was in London in the 1800s, just going along that area right there, with all of the smoke and with all of the chemicals.

And a couple of summers ago, for the last two summers, I worked on the river with the university masters students. And when we would come up the river from the corner, about a kilometre past the bridge up to the bridge, it was all we could do to not breathe, like, it was disgusting.

We would see, at certain times of the day, the smoke coming from the stacks at River Rouge, which is a great North American industrial achievement, the smoke would turn from white to yellow to orange.

And it's just...I don't know if those things are being monitored, and if they are, people just...you know, they're within their quotas. But the small is disgusting. We can smell it at the University, you know, maybe once every two weeks or so, and people outside are saying, oh, what's that, what's that, I bet it's nothing.

Well, I know what it is and I know it's not very healthy. And when I see...I remember during the SARS scare, there was a number of students...well, not a number, maybe four or five that I saw had masks on, and I didn't think that was too bad of an idea for days like that, when the smoke comes down into our university.

The most concerning...this is basically the last thing I have. The most concerning item I have here may be the lack of awareness of the Great Lakes basin and its importance, specifically...and I mean mostly through my generation and younger generations. I see I'm really...me and another girl are the only young people here.

And this symposium or this meeting was only advertised in the Windsor Star, which a lot of people don't read. Or maybe they just pass through it and they don't take advantage of it. I did not hear it on the radio, I did not hear it on TV, there was no banners, no pamphlets, no anything.

There's a lot of people I know that don't even know about the IJC. And the IJC is – I mean, I don't want to flatter you – but one of the few good...what's it called...

UNIDENTIFIED: (inaudible)...

MATTHEW DOHERTY: Cooperative groups among our two countries, one of the few good things either of our governments have ever done. Where am I here...specifically, the IJC should take steps to bring about education and awareness back to how it was in the 60s and 70s, when what we see now, all of the advancements that were taken to clean our lakes was because what people saw was going on and drove a grassroots movement, playing a large part in the improved Great Lakes seeing the day.

I don't think it's too farfetched to say the next few years will determine the direction, forward or backward, that the Great Lakes basin goes in the future.

To end, I am reminded of a Neil Young song, I'm a big Neil Young fan, it's called Sungreen, from his 2002 album Greendale. And it says, we've got to get up, we've got to get going, if they follow us, there's no way of knowing.

It's as simple as that. I really...I think the real big issue is the fact that people today just are not aware of the importance of the Great Lakes and not aware of the problems. And I think the IJC would be the perfect forum to take that and take that ball and run with it.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Thank you.

HERB GRAY: Thank you very much. (APPLAUSE) Thank you very much for your comments. This ends the list of people who have given us an indication they wish to speak, and we are very close to the 9:00 adjournment period.

So having said that, I would like to thank you all for coming and giving the speakers your patient attention. I'd like to thank all of the speakers. You have made a real contribution to the gathering of opinion which will help advise, if not instruct the governments when they begin their review.

We thank you all for coming. And I would also like to say that after the meeting ends – I think I can speak for Chairman Schornack as well as myself – we'll spend a little time with you if you'd like, just one on one or informal discussions.

And we look forward to the review being underway and the opportunities you will have to comment once it's underway. And in addition, please don't

forget to make use of the other means of expressing your opinion as posted on the slides – Internet, toll-free telephone, fax, old-fashioned mail, and something very innovative, our interactive Web dialogue.

So having said that, I want to thank you again and I declare this meeting adjourned. Thank you very much. (APPLAUSE)
