

THIS IS NOT A LOVE-IN

CANADA—U.S. WATER RELATIONS

Red River Valley Water Supply Project - North Dakota's latest ploy for resurrecting the Garrison Diversion Project

*A Valentine's Day Public Forum
hosted by the Manitoba Eco-Network*

Guest speakers include:

Susan Howatt

National Water Campaigner, Council of Canadians

Beatrice Olivastri

Chief Executive Officer, Friends of the Earth Canada

Don Norquay

Assistant Deputy Minister, Manitoba Water Stewardship

North Dakota speaker (TBA)

Sponsored by
Manitoba Water Stewardship
Walter & Duncan Gordon Foundation

this is not a love-in

Public Forum on Canada/US Water Relations – February 14, 2006

Agenda

1. **Welcome** by **Janine Gibson** (moderator) President of the Canadian Organic Growers and co-chair of the Manitoba Eco-Network Water Caucus
2. **Prayer** by **Gary Morningstar Raven**, Anishinaabe Turtle Island Protectors, Hollow Water First Nation
3. **Brief Introduction of the issue** by **Glen Koroluk**, Water Caucus Coordinator, Manitoba Eco-Network

4. Panelists

Don Norquay is currently Assistant Deputy Minister, Ecological Services Division, with Manitoba Water Stewardship. He assumed this role upon the creation of the Department in November, 2003. Mr. Norquay's Division includes Branches responsible for Planning & Coordination, Water Science & Management, and Fisheries, as well as the Office of Drinking Water. Don is also an Executive Board Member with the Red River Basin Commission, and serves on the Board of the Manitoba Habitat Heritage Corporation. Prior to his assignment in water, Don served as an Assistant Deputy Minister with Manitoba Transportation from 1994 to 2003. Prior to public service, Don practiced law in Winnipeg, having graduated with a Bachelor of Laws and a Bachelor of Arts from the University of Manitoba.

Susan Howatt is the national water campaigner with the Council of Canadians, the largest citizen watchdog group in Canada. Before joining the Council, she was the international campaigner with the Indonesian Mining Advocacy Network (Jatam), an organization that works with communities impacted by the mining industry. Susan was the cofounder of Unofficial Opposition, an umbrella group that advocated for social services in British Columbia. She has worked extensively as a communications consultant for anti-poverty, first nations and human rights groups in Vancouver and served as a human rights observer in Chiapas, Mexico.

Beatrice Olivastrì is the Chief Executive Officer of Friends of the Earth Canada (FOE), a member of the 71 country federation of Friends of the Earth International all dedicated to campaigning on the most urgent environmental and social issues of our time. In her position as CEO since 1996, she initiated FOE's legal program, led the award winning stratospheric ozone protection campaign and acted as an advisor to Canada's Commissioner for Environment and Sustainable Development. Prior to taking the senior staff position at FOE, she played strategic roles in the environment and sustainable development field as co-founder of Canada's New Direction Group, Director of Development of the Geneva-based Centre for Our Common Future and consultant to CIDA's China Desk and to the Organization of American States on the application of environmentally sound technology.

5. Questions from the floor

Resources

Beatrice Olivastrì

CEO, Friends of the Earth Canada
<http://www.foecanada.org>
260 St. Patrick Street, Suite 300,
Ottawa, Ontario, K1N 5K5, Canada
1-888-385-4444
Beatrice@foecanada.org

Susan Howatt

National Water Campaigner, Council of Canadians
<http://www.canadians.org>
700-170 Laurier Avenue West,
Ottawa, Ontario, K1P 5V5, Canada
1-800-387-7177
showatt@canadians.org

Don Norquay

Assistant Deputy Minister,
Province of Manitoba, Department of Water Stewardship
http://www.gov.mb.ca/waterstewardship/water_info/transboundary/index.html
200 Saulteaux Crescent,
Winnipeg, Manitoba, R3J 3W3, Canada
1-866-626-4862

For more information

Manitoba Wildlands 1-204-947-3400
http://manitobawildlands.org/water_trans.htm
Manitoba Eco-Network Water Caucus 1-204-943-0318
http://www.mbeconetwork.org/projects_water.asp
Indigenous Environmental Network 1-218-751-4967
<http://www.ienearth.org/>
People to Save the Sheyenne River 1-701-845-4044
<http://savethesheyenne.org/>
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Dakotas Area Office
1-701-250-4242
<http://www.usbr.gov/gp/dkao/>
Red River Valley Water Supply Project
<http://www.rvwsp.com/>
Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs 1-204-956-0610
<http://www.manitobachiefs.com/enviro/environ.html>
Munk Centre for International Studies
Program on Water Issues 1-416-946-8919
<http://www.powi.ca>

Contents

Introduction
Glen Koroluk
4

Welcome
Janine Gibson
4

Red River Valley Supply Project
Don Norquay
6

Our Water at Stake
Susan Howatt
7

Taking Action
Beatrice Olivastri
8

Closing
Janine Gibson
12

Appendices

Appendix I
Press Advisory
14

Appendix II
Right Hon. Prime Minister of Canada
15

Manitoba Eco-Network

FEBRUARY 14, 2006

Janine Gibson invites Glen Koroluk to present on the topic of the Red River Valley Water Supply project (RRVW).

GLEN KOROLUK: As background to this proposal, the Garrison water diversion was a scheme proposed in North Dakota to move water from the Missouri River basin across the Continental Divide into the Red River basin. Eventually the water would end up in the Hudson Bay in Manitoba. The purpose was irrigation. This project has come back many times since the fifties in different formats, in different plans, and in different ideas.

The International Joint Commission (IJC), a body comprised of fifty percent U.S. representatives and fifty percent Canadian representatives, made a key recommendation after they studied the Garrison Diversion project. Moving water across the Continental Divide brings the risk of potential harmful effects from pollutants. From a Canadian perspective, there is a great potential of having harmful biota and invasive species introduced into the Hudson Bay drainage basin. It is an intact system at present, an entire ecosystem, but the invasion of foreign species is a threat which will contribute to the loss of original species and habitat. My understanding is that species invasion is the second leading factor in our worldwide loss of species. So, the Garrison is where this project comes from, and it holds the same dangers.

The Red River Valley Water Supply project is currently under review in the United States by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of the Interior, and the Secretary of the Interior. It is an environmental impact study. They are holding hearings in North Dakota and Minnesota starting last week, and going on for another couple of weeks. I know some of our panelists are heading down to the hearings in Fargo tomorrow to make our presentations.

This water supply project has seven options. Four of the options involve plans similar to the Garrison Diversion project, and that is moving water from the Missouri into the Red River. Our objective is to get Canadians and Americans fully informed about this project; to raise the issue that these types of diversions are harmful, and not a good idea.

The Bureau of Reclamation will conduct its environmental hearings based on a draft, and the Secretary of the Interior in the U.S. (on George Bush's Cabinet) will make a political decision as to whether or not this project can proceed. For instance, are they able to build a diversion structure that affects another nation?

JANINE GIBSON: This evening what I want to ask of Bea Olivastri, the chief executive officer of Friends of the Earth Canada, is how many people know of Friends of the Earth Canada? Okay, great. Susan Howatt is the national water campaigner with the Council of Canadians. How many people know Council of Canadians? All right.

And Don Norquay is currently the Assistant Deputy Minister, Ecological Services Division, with Manitoba Water Stewardship. How many knew that there was that division? Pretty good. Let's thank them all for being with us this evening. Okay. Don, we will start with you, so please take it away.

DON NORQUAY: I really appreciate the opportunity provided by Manitoba Eco-Network and the Water Caucus to be here, and to speak with concerned citizens in Manitoba about the Red River Valley Water Supply project.

We have presented the province's concerns formally in response to the draft environmental impact statement. We were down in Grand Forks on February 7th: my remarks today will follow the presentation that was given by our expert, Dwight Williamson. He is a scientist who knows these issues very well and has briefed me on the technical sides. Senior executives rely heavily on people like Dwight to give us sound scientific advice and information.

At the start of our presentation on the draft environmental impact statement we talked about a shared interest in the Red River basin with our neighbours in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota. We indicated our willingness to work together collectively to manage these waters for the benefit of the basin as a whole. Just as we have worked together on flood prevention and mitigation measures, in particular since 1997, we are willing to work together with our neighbours in North Dakota and throughout the basin area in a similar way with joint drought and management planning.

The motive behind the Red River Valley Water Supply Project is a concern that sometime during the next 50 years we will have a repeat of the 1930's drought. They are looking to find a means of ensuring they can carry on as best they can with adequate water in that kind of a drought scenario.

Although we have concerns about how they have developed their scenarios for the future, the projections and the conservation measures they are proposing are to try to live within the basin's resources; so we think we can share work with them and develop a proper drought management plan. We have enlisted the support of the Red River Basin Commission (North Dakota is a member) to work with us and to collaborate on a basin wide approach. We have asked the Bureau of Reclamation to hold off on a final recommendation until we have come up with what we think is a better, more integrated, holistic basin wide drought management plan.

After talking about our shared interests, we spoke of Manitoba's interests. Some of the alternatives identified in this draft pose a significant risk of harm to the environment and natural resources in our province: in particular, to the ecosystem in Lake Winnipeg, the world's tenth largest freshwater lake. We confirmed the importance of the lake to us -- the fact that there is a million catch from the fishery. The largest inland fishery in Canada is in Manitoba with 800 commercial fishers licensed to operate on Lake Winnipeg. Many of these are First Nations people to whom fishing is both a traditional way of life, and a sole source of income. The Red River is the most important angling and sport fishing destination in the province, with recreational expenditures of around twelve million dollars annually. The region is an important tourist destination, generating revenues in the region of 110 million dollars. A lot of recreational property along the shore of Lake Winnipeg generates millions of dollars in local taxes and economic activity. So we have a lot at stake economically, socially, and environmentally with any risk to our aquatic ecosystem health in Manitoba, and we do believe that some of the alternatives under consideration would pose a significant risk of harm to the international Red River basin in Manitoba.

We expressed to the Bureau of Reclamation our preference for an in-basin solution. There are two in-basin alternatives considered in their environmental impact

assessments which involve water sources in North Dakota and in the larger basin area. We believe these options should be explored, and they are consistent with the sustainable water management principles that respect natural systems and commit us to live within the means of the basin's water availability means. They employ a combination of water management techniques including conservation, and they do not rely upon importing water from an adjacent basin and from neighbours who may need the same water during periods of future drought. Contemporary water management principles suggest that current and projected water supply needs should be met through the development of a sustainable basin-wide strategy, which favours using in-basin resources as the first priority.

We have a lot of concerns about the projections that they have made for water needs into the future. They are projecting that water needs will double over the next fifty years. Their proposal is to address the doubling of those needs for domestic and industrial purposes, but they are projecting only a nine percent reduction in use through the water conservation measures. We think that they can do much, much better. We have offered to work with them to develop a basin-wide water conservation potential study using the water soft path approach. Beatrice will speak more about that later.

We have urged the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake a more thorough assessment along these lines and to come back with more reasonable projections, then assess the necessary alternatives to meet those more realistic requirements. If importation of water from the Missouri River is determined to be the only reasonable means possible, then it must adequately protect downstream interests. Within the Boundary Waters Treaty Article 4 states: "The waters herein defined as boundary waters and waters flowing across the Boundary shall not be polluted on either side to the injury of health or property of the other" (signed in 1909 between Great Britain, on behalf of Canada, and the United States). Since we believe that three of the options being considered by the Bureau of Reclamation would pollute the boundary waters of the Red River, then they would be in contravention of this treaty.

The Red River Valley Supply project will use some of the infrastructure on the Missouri side that was constructed as part of Garrison Diversion project which Glen mentioned. It will take water from the McClusky canal, which is infrastructure from the Garrison Diversion Unit (they call it that), and pipe it into the Sheyenne River. This is North Dakota's preferred option. Although they will partially treat that water for biota, our concern is that it will be adequate to deal with biota that is in the Missouri, but not in the Red River basin.

The Garrison project was reviewed in 1977 by the IJC, and their recommendation was that they could go ahead with an import of water from the Missouri if Canada and the United States could agree on an appropriate level of treatment for the water before it crosses the basin divide. Our position is that if importation is absolutely necessary, it can only be accomplished if we agree on the level of treatment. They do have a level of treatment for biota, but it does not have any form of filtration. Without filtration, the turbidity levels in the water will render ultraviolet disinfection ineffective. In addition, there are biota such as Whirling disease protozoa (a fish parasite), and several other types that have similar characteristics, which are resistant to chlorine and U.V. disinfection. So what they are proposing for treatment is inadequate to remove organisms that can come in and propagate throughout our basin; potentially causing significant environmental

harm. What we are proposing to them is a treatment system that includes a form of dissolved air filtration. We think it is cost effective and feasible. We are open to dialogue with North Dakota on reaching an agreement on what kind of treatment is acceptable to us should importation from the Missouri be necessary.

We have approached the Red River Basin Commission on this issue as well, and North Dakota has agreed to engage the offices of the Commission to discuss just how downstream interests could be protected, including the question of acceptable levels of treatment. Unlike the Devil's Lake situation, there appears to be some openness to dialogue. People in significant positions within North Dakota have indicated a willingness to discuss the idea of treatment, and what might be reasonable, so I am hopeful there could still be a resolution of this and we can avoid unilateral action.

It is our position that if there is no agreement possible, then there should be a reference to the IJC to resolve a dispute. This is what the treaty was intended to do and it has worked in the past. The Devils Lake situation was the exception, and an anomaly, in the history of the treaty. The treaty has worked and it should be tried again and continue to be allowed to work.

Thank you. I will leave this slide up for a while if you don't mind, since it has a list of all the invasive species that we know about so far.

JANINE GIBSON: All right. We thank Don for his presentation. I hope you have been making notes on questions for Don and everyone else for later, but let's spend the next twenty minutes with Susan Howatt of the National Water Campaigner for the Council of Canadians.

SUSAN HOWATT: Well, thank you very much. It is very heartening to see a good turnout here in Winnipeg to talk about water -- which I find endlessly fascinating. Thanks to the Manitoba Eco-Network for pulling this event together.

Obviously there are enormous environmental concerns with invasive species and biota, and the impact that they will have on human health and the environment. There are lots of reasons why we as a country should be concerned about this project. How the State manages its water quantity, which also has some implications for its water quality, directly impacts us. We are more than just stakeholders in this decision.

North Dakota proposed a water diversion that will affect us, but they made no effort to educate or consult with the Canadian public -- we had to do it ourselves. A project of this size really requires a lot of different opinions and a lot of different needs and wants balanced. Furthermore, a diversion that will have environmental implications for the provinces of Manitoba, and also Ontario, is very much the business of the governments of those provinces and the Federal Government. I am really heartened to hear Manitoba's representatives say we are committed to working together to find a good solution, but I am very concerned that North Dakota will act unilaterally if not held to its obligations within the framework of international legal mechanisms.

One of the options was to take water out of Lake of Woods -- Ontario for example. Now, when rumours of this option surfaced last spring, Dalton McGinty, Ontario's Premier, said: "A random proposal is not going forward; we get to those discussions around a negotiating table, but I haven't been invited to a negotiating table." So that raises my flags a bit in terms of how the political process is evolving, and who is

brought to the table, and whose needs are really being met. Both the Red River Basin Commission and the International Joint Commission function on the guiding principle that Canada and the United States have an interconnected water system, and therefore should have interconnected decision-making processes.

Devils Lake was a disaster and a great example of where our water relationship just went right off the rails. The International Joint Commission is the referee on all things water. Its sole purpose is to prevent and resolve conflicts between Canada and the United States in our water world. I would argue this is also an excellent time for the International Joint Commission to play a role. I would like to see the International Joint Commission empowered to do exactly what it is supposed to; it is very clearly stated in the Boundary Waters Treaty that water flowing across the border shall not be polluted on either side to the injury of health or property of the other.

The treaty does grant downstream residents suffering injury the same rights as those that are upstream. Should Manitoba suffer serious injury due to a violation of that aspect of the treaty, hypothetically speaking, Manitobans do have legal rights within the framework of international mechanisms. Customarily, the two countries have chosen to go the diplomacy route, and set about apportionment treaties where there are early discussions about consequences and pollution levels, and what is appropriate; much of what Don outlined in the position of Manitoba. If North Dakota continues to act as the schoolyard bully, then the political consequences will be very real. Again, I would like to urge that the International Joint Commission assume a larger role.

As Glen said, there are postcards at the table. I encourage you to pick one up and take some action. I believe Margaret Mead when she said to not underestimate the power a small group of concerned citizens can have to change the world, because that is the only thing that ever has. I believe that the role of public education is for these moments when we can come together as a community and voice our concerns.

We elect our governments to act on our behalf. We need to encourage our governments at every level to be absolutely vigilant about the integrity of our ecosystem and the sovereignty of our water. Water is a precondition for all life. The number one issue people wrote in to the prime minister's office about recently was ballistic missile defense. The number two issue, to the tune of hundreds of thousands of letters, was about water. Canadians care about water. We care so much about our own water since it matters to our livelihoods, our economies, and our health. And we have the political tools. So this is the moment where we need to come together as a community and push our governments to use that.

Thanks.

JANINE GIBSON: Thank you. I recognize a few people from our Red River Basin Commission. Don, you are on the board. Well, let's welcome Bea, the chief executive officer of Friends of the Earth.

BEATRICE OLIVASTRI: Thanks to the Eco-Network for having this meeting in Winnipeg. Friends of the Earth is proud of the volunteers we work with here, and Claire and Lawrence are two of them. They keep me passionate and energized about how important water issues are locally, provincially, nationally, and internationally. I spent so

much of my life last year in Devils Lake: with Claire, with Lawrence, with others; and frankly, I don't think the issue is over yet.

I also want to talk about a way that I think we can take charge of our water futures, our water economy: a way to not be a victim; a way to deal with issues around water. That means we would be looking with fresh eyes at how we deal with water; that we work with nature instead of trying to conquer nature; that we would take a more appropriate approach to water than what I would suggest we still do now based on--I have an Italian background so I can get away with this--a Roman approach to aqueducts. Remember those? Digging ditches, building pipelines, transporting water long distances to have a very specific function that perhaps could better be addressed where needed, as needed.

Friends of the Earth's approach is different, what we call a water soft path or ways of building a restorative economy. I am not going to say a lot about that because we do have some booklets at the back, but I just want to get that notion in your head, that we don't have to be victims about it; we have some choices. I commend the Government of Manitoba. The fact that Don is Assistant Deputy Minister of Ecological Services is amazing. The notion of ecological services is an extremely important concept: services we expect and need to support and protect in a way from various parts of our ecosystem. But more importantly, that you have a water stewardship department in Manitoba that no one else in Canada has. That is an insight, a way of managing this resource and protecting it that bodes well for what I think can be accomplished in Manitoba, and what I think the rest of Canada needs to learn about. Don's expert, Dwight Williamson is a terrific guy and extremely polite in his remarks.

I have read the various documents about this proposed project -- and the U.S. E.P.A. critique about this is very polite -- but they have some questions about the projections. Environment Canada's comments were equally polite. You know what, this thing is a distortion; it is a botched use of statistics. It is the kind of thing that makes you want to say: "The emperor has no clothes, has anybody noticed?" The projections are way, way, way off the reality scale for North Dakota. Even if they go into intensive agriculture the way California does, this is ridiculous. California by the way, a State that has as you can imagine, severe water challenges, has been dealing with this kind of soft path approach that I have mentioned in a way that shows immense opportunities: savings from thirty percent up to fifty percent in some cases of costs of dealing with water. They try to address the problems and the needs where they exist. Far from perfect, there is still a lot of work to do in California. Nevertheless, there is a great deal of experience there that I would suggest North Dakota could take advantage of in the west, not out here in Canada.

At Friends of the Earth we have the distinction of having Dr. David Brooks as our director of research. He has spent the last fifteen years on water demand management from a novel, I like to say radical, but a distinctive approach with helping countries. The last five years he has been with us, thinking of how we start to make some decisions about water planning in our jurisdictions that would be more appropriate, such as how do we approach water as delivering a service instead of as the need itself? So for example, we always get into toilet humour when we talk about water. I hope everyone will bear with me, but when we look at the use of water for transporting waste, in which we all have this experience, eighty percent of the cost that you will deal with is for moving the

waste from the point source to the point where it is dealt with. What we need to do is try and deal with the waste; or if you were dealing with an industrial example, the pollution at the point where it occurs. You would first of all be able to mobilize a fair amount of resources to treat it there because you are saving eighty percent, roughly speaking. Looking at solving problems where they occur is an important part of what we want to do. So is looking at the resource, in this case water, as a service rather than an end. And what I want to do is to plan for the future: empower ourselves to make choices and then to work backwards to what do we have to do differently today.

On that basis, one of the things we have to do differently today is politicize this issue. If David Brooks were here, he would be dealing with the technology and planning issues. I am going to deal with the political issues, because these are issues that are in your backyard, and are obviously a concern because you are here tonight. But they are equally a concern and should be a priority for all Canadians. I want to tell you what our new Prime Minister had to say. Last year he was whipping through Winnipeg for a barbeque and, according to the way he saw the Liberal treatment on Devils Lake, he said they were always poking a stick in the Americans' eyes on things that don't matter to Canadians. All right, I think we could change that perspective, but when it comes to vital Canadian issues like water or BSE crisis, they are nowhere to be seen. So Mr. Harper said Conservative MPs were forced to go to the U.S. to fight an injunction against Canadian beef because Paul Martin's government wouldn't do it, and it will come to doing the same with the diversion of Devils Lake water into the Red River.

Folks, water is nowhere in Mr. Harper's agenda right now. How about if we work together to get it there? The Liberal pledge for research money in the political period before the election, not just for Lake Winnipeg as I understand it, but for the basin, is a very important contribution of money. Now, as far as I can tell, it's nowhere to be seen because it was lost in the new government's mandate. I think we need to clearly say we want that kind of money re-pledged. I don't care if Mr. Harper wants to make it his commitment. The point is there are important things that need to happen here. We need that investment, and the \$1.1 million that was made as a commitment last spring needs to be spotlighted so that it continues long term.

I was in university in the 1970s, studying Environmental Studies at the University of Waterloo, when the first Garrison diversion reference came through. This was a huge, huge experience: a breakthrough undertaking, further underlining the value and importance of the IJC. So I was pretty interested last year as issues came to a head around Devils Lake and I started being a little bit more proactive on behalf of Friends of the Earth about April last year. It was the one-year anniversary of Canada's request for reference, which we never got. It's an incredibly important mechanism, and the fact that we could not get a reference on Devils Lake is something we still have to think about. We do want Canada to start to prepare for reference on this Red River project; I think that is critical. But we have to make the point in the weeks to come that Canada and the U.S. are both in breach of their enforcement duties. Neither of them is honouring their commitment to enforce the Boundary Waters Treaty. And because the U.S. never agreed with the call for the reference, Canada had, and still has, an option for a unilateral reference. Like many people last year I felt that recommending that step would somewhat undercut the IJC. In reflection, I think it is something we need to insist on now. The IJC will give a kind of knee jerk response because they have been doing this for a couple of

decades saying: “we never had a unilateral reference, don't know what to do with it.” But they have had a U.S. experience where they were asked to do some work. It wasn't officially called a reference so it kind of slid through without Canada's engagement. I think we need to pump up the political will on a unilateral reference.

My suggestion to you, with the Manitoba Federal Members of Parliament, is to take a positive reinforcement step to remind them of the heat and passion and urgency of the emergency debate that was held at the instigation of Manitoba MPs last June. Call on them to bring back that same spirit of cross-party cooperation. It was an all-party resolution, calling for Canada to deal with a reference to the IJC. Let's get Manitoba MPs of whatever stripe back in play, and let's talk about what could be accomplished through the IJC. What I would like to suggest in this case is that we get the IJC involved in looking at needs, not just the chemical and biota issues (which I agree with).

These issues have come a long way since the 1977 reference: the biota are amazingly more dramatic and loathsome. But the IJC terms of reference could call for an alternative approach to needs assessments. I think we need to somewhat diplomatically start with saying the emperor has no clothes, that the projections and data and Red River work is somewhat off. But if we start at Devils Lake and then stepping stone wise, we want a reference on that, or some creative language to them that says get some work done on it still, and then preparation for a reference on the Red River -- that's a two-step approach.

I hope each one of you will take some time to call your MP or drop a note to say, if you are a new MP, here is what our representative did last June at the House of Commons; if you are back, you will remember because you were involved in this debate and we want you to do it again. Some of you might remember the acid rain battles: there was a huge amount of all-party cooperation when we were dealing with acid rain issues. I don't know about you, but I would like my politicians to earn the money we are paying them to do something productive, not just to slam each other. This is an area where some all-party statesmanship could very well reflect your interests and Canada's interests.

The other thing I wanted to mention is an example of how to look at the soft path approach. And Don, did I hear you say that Freshwater Fisheries earn annually twenty-five million dollars?

DON NORQUAY: In Lake Winnipeg alone.

BEATRICE OLIVASTRI: There is something about twenty million resonating and I just want to play it through a little bit here. I gave you a toilet example of soft path thinking: what I want to give you is a drinking water example. Devils Lake is a community of about 7,500 people on this very big lake, deep, awesome, terrifying, and dirty. They have their drinking water from groundwater mixed with arsenic. The U.S. put in place this January a requirement for arsenic levels that suggest that they are in compliance with their own drinking water provisions. Over the last couple of years, they knew this was coming; they were talking about what they were going to do to bring in piped drinking water. The magic number was about twenty-five million dollars in costs. As Canadians we have talked about helping, even pre-financing if necessary, a more sophisticated filter for a Devils Lake outlet; more than the 800 bucks worth of gravel they dumped there that didn't work, and the dollar figure is in the twenty million dollar range for U.V. and other

combined treatments. The Devil's Lake group raised about a million dollars towards twenty-five million for clean drinking water costs.

We have twenty-five million dollars worth of freshwater fish on Lake Winnipeg alone, at risk, I would submit, not only from Devils Lake but these bigger issues. We have got a bunch of Canadian technology that is going to be at least twenty million, whoever pays for it, for dealing with the outlet water. So I kind of feel like Marie Antoinette saying, "let them eat cake," or how about if we let them drink their own water? What if we said, let's deal with the problem where it occurs? Let's see if we could bring together the kind of really amazing Canadian technology that we have for water treatment -- supported by your tax dollars, by the way. Why don't we use this and why don't we talk about a trade mission? When the Premier comes back from India, how about a trade mission of Team Canada, with our new Prime Minister, going to North Dakota to talk about technology to clean up Devils Lake water? And by the way, they want to use it for irrigation, and they don't know how to do that either, so let's put our thinking caps on.

I don't know if this is the same spirit you were talking about Don, about working with North Dakota. I could present this in a sarcastic way, but I actually view it in a useful way: something where people to people, community to community, business to business, we could try something different. We could flip around the notion of the way to deal with a problem of too much water today, is to dump it, send it downstream, not clean it up, and then at the point where we know we don't have enough, to go grab water somewhere. So as I said, I am not done with Devils Lake personally; I am compelled to still work on that even though the much larger and bigger valley supply project is looming.

I hope I have given you some insight into different ways of thinking about these issues. I hope I have instilled in you some interest in picking up the phone to talk to your MP, or sending him or her a note, asking them to keep working hard for you on this. And also I hope you will join me in insisting to our new Prime Minister that this is a priority for all Canadians. And as Manitobans, you have got lots of experience and passion about this to engage the rest of the Canadians, and it should be an all-party exercise in leadership.

Thanks for your attention tonight.

JANINE GIBSON: Thank you, Bea.

Any of you are welcome to come to the microphone if you need help projecting; some of us are not able to speak as loudly. So you can either ask a question at the mike or just stand up or maybe state your name and to whom you are directing your question and let's have a discussion. You have brought yourself out, and in a world of choices you have chosen to be with us tonight and we appreciate it. So let's have some response to what our panel has shared with us, we invite your questions.

(QUESTION PERIOD)

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

Press Advisory

For Immediate Release

February 14, 2006

Canada/United States Water Conflicts Escalating...

The Red River Valley Water Supply Project, a \$500 million to \$2.3 billion water diversion proposal, is North Dakota's latest attempt to resurrect the ill-fated Garrison Diversion Project. The Garrison Diversion, first proposed in the 50's, would have transferred large amounts of water into the Hudson Bay Drainage Basin from the Missouri River Basin.

The International Joint Commission (IJC) studied the Garrison Diversion and in 1977 advised that it should not proceed unless and until the Governments of Canada and U.S. agreed on proven mitigation to eliminate the risk of biota transfer and disease transfer or that those issues were no longer a concern.

To combat the piecemeal resurrection of the Garrison Diversion, the Council of Canadians, Friends of the Earth Canada and the Indigenous Environmental Network have joined forces to monitor and inform Canadian and US citizens on the potential devastating impacts that can occur should the project proceed to transfer water from the Missouri into the Red. This working group is calling on both governments to respect the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 and to respect Indigenous Nations Sovereignty including Tribal/First Nations Rights to water.

The group believes that North Dakota's water supply dilemma can be solved from within the Red River Basin. Options that include demand side management, water reuse, water recycling and conservation can help communities in the Red River Valley meet their future water needs.

The working group will be on tour in the region at the following locations:

Tuesday, February 14 7:00 pm. Winnipeg Millennium Library, Winnipeg, MB

Event: Public Forum at Carol Shields Library

Contact: Glen Koroluk 204-943-0318

Wednesday, February 15 1:00 pm. Black Building 402 – 118 Broadway, Fargo, ND

Event: Press Conference

Thursday, February 16 7:00 pm. Bemidji State University, Bemidji, MN

Event: Public Forum at Crying Wolf Room, Hobson Memorial Union

For more info:

Susan Howatt 1-613-761-2482 Council of Canadians

Beatrice Olivastri 1-613-724-8690 Friends of the Earth Canada

Robert Shimek 1-218-751-4967 1-218-760-0284 (cell) Indigenous

Environmental Network



no
postage
required

Right Hon. Prime Minister of Canada
House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Dear Prime Minister Harper,

Canada suffered a political, ecological and economic set back in 2005, when North Dakota opened the Devils Lake water diversion outlet, potentially releasing harmful biota and pollutants into the Red River. The Red River Valley Water Supply Project currently under consideration in North Dakota could have even more devastating consequences for Canada. This project plans for the inter-basin transfer of water from the Missouri River Basin to the Hudson Bay Basin via the Red River, threatening the health of Canada's waterways and their associated industries. Article IV of the Boundary Waters Treaty states that "waters flowing across the boundary shall not be polluted on either side to the injury of health or property of the other".

I call on the Government of Canada to take action on the following points:

- Insist on comprehensive mitigation measures for the Devils Lake outlet under the "polluter pays" principle before more water flows.
- Reiterate its position to the US that the risk of biota transfer must be eliminated and proven to the satisfaction of the Governments of Canada and the United States.
- Reference the Red River Valley Water Supply Project for review to the International Joint Commission immediately and urge the US to do likewise.

Signature _____

NAME (Please print) _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____ PROV. _____ POSTAL CODE _____