Section III: 
Water Perspectives

Activity 1: Water Conflicts

Students will analyze various texts from differing sources relating to one event that is relevant to water in our communities.

Activity 2: Water: Commodity or Commons

Students will explore the definitions for Commodity, Commons, Public water management and private water management, and learn to associate those terms with defining characteristics.

Activity 3: Personal Reflection – Water Democracy

Students will engage in a personal reflection about our individual and collective responsibility to water, what democracy means for them.

These lessons are designed to support high school teachers in integrating water issues into their curriculum. This resource was written by Polaris Institute project staff member, Daniel Cayley-Daoust as a part of the Gr.10 Civics and Citizenship resource entitled Water Perspectives: Conflict and Action. Expertise and advice was provided by a local steering committee and volunteer resource reviewers. Special thanks to the following individuals for their support in making this resource possible: Rebecca McQuaid, Andy Kerr, Susan Brandum, Patricia Larkin (Nature Works Learning) and Paul Baines. Thanks to everyone else not named here, who have been supportive of this initiative.

This project was sponsored by the Ontario Trillium Foundation (www.otf.ca).

A French translation of this resource will be made available.

The Polaris Institute is an Ottawa-based non-governmental organization that has been in existence since 1997. Our main goal is to enable citizen movements to develop new methods, strategies and tools in order to bring about democratic social change. As a result, most of our past educational work has focused on helping students to develop the critical thinking and leadership skills necessary to bring about on-the-ground action.

We welcome any and all feedback on this educational resource.

For more information or to contact us, visit: www.polarisinstitute.org/education
Activity 1 - Water Conflicts

Learning Goals: To analyze various sources of information, identify bias and identify main characteristics of an event or situation.

Curriculum Outcomes Targeted (Gr 10 Civics and Citizenship, 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strand A – Political Inquiry and Skill Development</th>
<th>A1. Political Inquiry: use the political inquiry process and the concepts of political thinking when investigating issues, events, and developments of civic importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1.2 select and organize relevant evidence, data, and information on issues, events, and/or developments of civic importance from a variety of primary and secondary sources, ensuring that their sources reflect multiple perspectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1.3 assess the credibility of sources relevant to their investigations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strand B – Civic Awareness</th>
<th>B1. Civic Issues, Democratic Values: describe beliefs and values associated with democratic citizenship in Canada, and explain how they are related to civic action and to one’s position on civic issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1.1 describe some civic issues of local, national, and/or global significance and compare the perspectives of different groups on selected issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description: Different sources of information with various backgrounds or bias are presented to the students and they are then asked to answer a series of questions to analyze the information present in the documents and evaluate the information from various sources of information.

Time Required: 60 minutes (for one or two cases)

Materials & Preparation:

- **Materials:** Print out all of the sources of information (BLM 3.1) for selected event(s) and associated Question Sheet (BLM 3.2).
- **Activity:** The teacher can prepare the activity by choosing to use one or all of the cases presented (See BLM 3.1 – note that each event has more than one article or source associated with it). Note: you can get students to do one individually, and another one in small groups. Teacher could do activity to get familiar with texts and questions.

Teaching Strategy:

- Choose one of the following two approaches, or a combination of both:
  - **Individual work:** Hand out event information to each student (BLM 3.1) and get them to answer the questions (BLM 3.2). Once that is complete, you can review answers in a larger group while seeking input from a wide variety of students in the class for each answer.
  - **Small group work:** Divide class into small groups and hand out the information for one event to each group (BLM 3.1) and get them to answer the questions (BLM 3.2). Once that is complete, you can review answers in a larger group while seeking input from a wide variety of students in the class for each answer.
  - **Combination of individual and group work:** Do one case individually, go over answers in a larger group, then do another case in a small groups and go over answers in a larger
group. It will take more time than the other two options, but could also be inverted, or the individual one could be done as homework.

- The teacher can refer to (BLM 3.3) for tips and answers.
(BLM 3.1) – Events for analysis and associated texts

1st Event: Shale gas fracking to be banned in Nova Scotia

Description: September 3rd 2014, the Government of Nova Scotia made an announcement about upcoming legislation that will prohibit onshore shale gas fracking.

Document #1: Original Press Release by Nova Scotia Energy Minister
Date: September 3rd 2014
Source: News Release, Nova Scotia Province Website

Government to Prohibit Hydraulic Fracturing

Energy
September 3, 2014 2:07 PM

Energy Minister Andrew Younger announced today, Sept. 3, the government of Nova Scotia will introduce legislation this fall to prohibit high volume hydraulic fracturing for onshore shale gas.

"Nova Scotians have overwhelmingly expressed concern about allowing high volume hydraulic fracturing to be a part of onshore shale development in this province at this time," said Mr. Younger. "Our petroleum resources belong to Nova Scotians, and we must honour the trust people have put in us to understand their concerns. We will therefore introduce legislation to prohibit using this technique to stimulate onshore shale projects."

The decision comes after considering comments submitted by many Nova Scotians over the past 10 months, as well as studies, including an independent review commissioned by the government of Nova Scotia, and the recent Council of Canadian Academies' report for the federal government.

The minister and government have also received input from Mi’kmaq communities in a variety of ways.

"I also spoke this morning with Mi'kmaq Chiefs Paul Prosper, Terrance Paul, and Sidney Peters and they expressed support for the government’s decision to prohibit hydraulic fracturing operations in shale petroleum developments," said Mr. Younger. "Our cabinet met with the Assembly of Nova Scotia Mi'kmaq Chiefs earlier this year and this was among the issues discussed at that time.

"The first onshore well in Nova Scotia was drilled in 1869 and petroleum development remains an important part of our energy and economic future. Coal gas methane projects, such as the current well-supported project in Stellarton, and developing our offshore resources remain key priorities of government."

All submissions, presentations, and documents for the hydraulic fracturing review are available at www.cbu.ca/hfstudy.

The hydraulic fracturing report is available at http://energy.novascotia.ca/oil-and-gas/onshore/hydraulic-fracturing-review
Nova Scotia to introduce legislation to ban fracking for onshore shale gas

The Canadian Press

The Nova Scotia government says it will introduce legislation this fall to prohibit high-volume hydraulic fracturing for onshore shale gas.

Energy Minister Andrew Younger says he believes Nova Scotians are not comfortable with fracking.

Younger’s announcement today comes less than a week after a panel of experts released a report saying fracking shouldn’t be allowed until more independent research is done on health, environmental and economic impacts.

The panel also recommended setting up a process to get a community’s permission before a project is allowed to proceed.

A two-year moratorium on fracking was put in place by the previous NDP government in 2012 as public protests grew in Nova Scotia and in neighbouring New Brunswick.

Younger says the Liberal government made its decision following input from the public, including aboriginal leaders in the province.

“Nova Scotians have overwhelmingly expressed concern about allowing high-volume hydraulic fracturing to be a part of onshore shale development in this province at this time,” Younger said in a statement.

“Our petroleum resources belong to Nova Scotians, and we must honour the trust people have put in us to understand their concerns.”

Proponents of fracking say the industry could spur Nova Scotia’s stalled economy and reduce its reliance on polluting, coal-fired plants.

Fracking is a process that forces pressurized water and chemicals into layers of rock to release trapped oil and natural gas.
Nova Scotia govt.’s decision may result in missed opportunity

September 3, 2014

CALGARY, Alberta (September 3, 2014) – The Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers today expressed disappointment with the Nova Scotia government’s decision to preclude the use of hydraulic fracturing to develop the province’s onshore natural gas resources.

“The government’s decision appears to be largely based on considerations other than the technical knowledge and experience of industry regulators and experts in Canadian jurisdictions where hydraulic fracturing has been used safely for many decades to develop natural gas,” said Dave Collyer, president and CEO of the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers. “While the commercial viability of Nova Scotia’s onshore natural gas resource has yet to be fully proven, today’s announcement has the potential to preclude Nova Scotians from benefitting from the responsible development of this resource.”

Hydraulic fracturing has been used safely for more than 60 years in Western Canada, according to the provincial regulators in British Columbia and Alberta. Comprehensive government regulations and industry operating practices are in place in jurisdictions where natural gas is produced to ensure public safety and the protection of the environment.

We expect technology to continue to improve, and this will be reflected in both industry performance and regulatory requirements.

“We encourage the government of Nova Scotia to continue to assess regulations, industry’s strong technical base and safe operating practices used in other parts of Canada,” Collyer said. “We also encourage the Nova Scotia government to provide the flexibility to allow the future development of onshore natural gas as it drafts legislation this fall.”

The Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers (CAPP) represents companies, large and small, that explore for, develop and produce natural gas and crude oil throughout Canada. CAPP’s member companies produce about 90 per cent of Canada’s natural gas and crude oil. CAPP’s associate members provide a wide range of services that support the upstream crude oil and natural gas industry. Together CAPP’s members and associate members are an important part of a national industry with revenues of about $110 billion a year. CAPP’s mission is to enhance the economic sustainability of the Canadian upstream petroleum industry in a safe and environmentally and socially responsible manner, through constructive engagement and communication with governments, the public and stakeholders in the communities in which we operate.
EAC Celebrates Forthcoming Anti-Fracking Legislation

Halifax -- The Ecology Action Centre is celebrating the Government of Nova Scotia’s announcement that it will introduce legislation to prohibit fracking in our province this fall.

“This announcement comes after months of hard work by people in Nova Scotia showing that fracking is not part of our future we need,” says Jennifer West, Ecology Action Centre’s geoscience coordinator. “This is truly a win for communities in Nova Scotia, and shows that the government and the public are willing to take leadership on the very complicated issue that is fracking.”

“We look forward to seeing the legislation and are eager to continue to be part of this important discussion. But for today, I’m happy knowing that fracking will stay out of Nova Scotia for the foreseeable future,” says West.

“I’m also very interested to know what the province’s plans are for regulating shale gas and coal bed methane exploration – as we know, exploration has been a huge issue in New Brunswick, and one we’d like to avoid here.”

“This process has shown that people in Nova Scotia are very interested in being consulted on all oil and gas extraction projects in the province,” says West. “I’m interested to see how the government plans to engage people in these issues.”

The Ecology Action will remain engaged in this issue as the legislation and regulations unfold, and encourage other people to stay informed and engaged as well.

We’d like to thank Dr. Wheeler and the panelists for their hard work throughout the fracking review. We’d also like to thank Minister Younger for making a swift decision about the panel’s recommendations and for recognizing the public’s opposition to fracking.

Most of all we’d like to thank every person who raised his or her voice and participated in this important discussion and made this legislation a possibility.
Dear Mayor and Members of Council,

The purpose of my writing is to correct information that appears in the Community Services Department Report 20R0069 Plastic Water Bottle Update of February 23 2009 and may be repeated again this evening by staff as well as by various individuals and organizations who appear before you opposed to the sale of bottled water in vending machines at City of Niagara Falls facilities.

I chose to write this letter to you rather than address these matters during my formal remarks this evening because my allocated presentation time will not afford me the time required to adequately address this misinformation.

My specific comments about certain statements in the report are as follows:

"Bottled water in Canada is treated as food and is regulated under the Food and Drug Act and its regulations. As such water bottling plants are inspected on average only once every three years."

This is incorrect. Bottled water is held to the same scrutiny as tap water. By law, Health Canada regulations for bottled water must be as strong and protective of public health as Ontario Ministry of Environment regulations for tap water. Bottled water is regulated as a packaged food product by Health Canada through the Food and Drug Act. With respect to regulation, the Regional Municipality of Waterloo for example reported on September 9 2008 that it did 10,000 tests on its water supply in 2007. Nestle Waters Canada performs more than 1700 tests on its water supply daily at its Aberfoyle plant or more in one week than Waterloo Region does in one year. A copy of our testing activities is available upon request. Testing is also conducted via surprise inspections by the Canadian Food Inspection Agency Health Canada, the Canadian Bottled Water Association and NSF. Nestle Waters Canada takes a multi-barrier approach to water safety. The Company subjects its finished products and source water to microbiological analysis every day that exceeds the microbiological requirements outlined in the Safe Water Drinking Act which governs both municipal tap water and bottled water.

The Company is required to test for 160 compounds in both source and finished product for coliform, E-coli (daily), coliform, E-coli (weekly), chemicals (quarterly), and metals, chemicals and minerals (annually). Water samples are also sent to a third party independent lab for analysis every week. Basic chemical and physical analysis of bottled water is completed daily. Annually we conduct a full spectrum analysis on each water source for primary inorganics, secondary inorganics, radiologicals, volatile organic compounds, organics, disinfection byproducts, pesticides, herbicides, physical contaminants as well as several other potential chemical contaminants. In addition to the tests identified above there are many online quality checks performed by our operators on an hourly basis to ensure the chemical microbiological and physical safety of the finished goods produced at our plants. Our testing levels meet or exceed all requirements of Health Canada and other governing bodies. The annual monitoring reports are conditions of our permits and are submitted to the province and other public agencies. As such they become public documents upon receipt.
“According to recent Member Communication provided by AMO Municipal councils across Canada including 13 Ontario municipalities have taken action in recent months to limit the use of bottled water in municipalities where appropriate to support the use of municipal tap water by residents and visitors”

This is incorrect. Thirty-two municipalities and school boards across Canada have formally rejected calls for bans on bottled water, while just 14 local governments, including eight from Ontario, have approved same, to date. Another 19 local jurisdictions are currently reviewing their options including the City of Niagara Falls. But rather than focus on bottled water, several thousand local governments have quite rightly determined that repairing aging water and sewer infrastructure, improving on the delivery of basic municipal services and keeping property taxes low are more important priorities, and most Canadians agree. In a survey conducted last Fall by Leger Marketing, a majority of Canadian taxpayers said they are opposed to bans on bottled water.

“Canada’s Parliament is currently considering a ban on plastic water bottles at the Parliament Buildings.”

This is incorrect.

“Currently 41% of recycling collection and net processing costs are paid for by industry stewards the remainder is paid by Niagara residents”

This is incorrect. By law, according to the requirements of the Ontario Waste Diversion Act, industry stewards like Nestle Waters Canada and its industry partners are required to pay 50 percent of the cost of Ontario’s blue box recycling program which they do.

[...] (comments made on many other statements, then concluding remarks below)

Mayor Salci and members of Council, our Company and our industry have nothing but the greatest respect for the democratic system and the right of individuals to express their opinions in a public forum such as a Committee or Council meeting of the City of Niagara Falls.

However the Council is a quasi-judicial entity and as such all statements made by individuals and organizations appearing before it should be based on fact. Our Company refuses to make statements that cannot be verified at source or through independent third party research.

Statements made quoting research about our business from such environmental lobbyists as the Council of Canadians, the Polaris Institute or the Suzuki Foundation are false statements as these organizations do not perform scientific peer reviewed studies of water, the bottled water industry or hydrogeology. The Suzuki Foundation, the Council of Canadians and Polaris Institute typically quote information found on the Internet or attributed to the Earth Policy Institute or the Pacific Institute, American environmental lobby groups that have no record of funding independent third party research on these matters.

We respectfully request that those opposed to bottled water no longer be given the intellectual free pass they have been afforded of late by some in the media and some in local government. As civic leaders we ask that you demand the same level of intellectual rigour from them that you expect of us.

Should you have any questions comments or concerns please do not hesitate to contact me at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

John B Challinor II APR
Director of Corporate Affairs
Park in the City Committee

R-2009-06 – Chief Administrative Officer – Plastic Water Bottle Update

The report recommends:

1. That the City of Niagara Falls eliminate the sale of bottled water at City owned facilities, municipal buildings, and recreation facilities and parks effective May 1, 2009.
2. That staff develop a recommended implementation plan to increase the access to, and the availability of municipal water through public drinking fountains in municipal indoor and outdoor facilities, and outline the costs in the 2009 capital budget for the consideration of Council.

ORDERED on the motion of Councillor Wing, seconded by Councillor Pietrangelo that John Challinor, Nestle Waters Canada be permitted to speak.

Carried Unanimously

John Challinor, Director of Corporate Affairs, Nestle Waters Canada, indicated that Nestle sells bottled water to stores and does not supply to vending machines. Nestle supports the use of tap water in pitchers at municipal meetings, as the bottled water is primarily an out-of-home product. He argued that banning bottled water will be problematic for emergency services and will force consumers at City facilities to switch to other less healthy beverages such as pop, which will not reduce plastic. Mr. Challinor indicated that a similar proposed Provincial bill was not passed. He advised that Nestle funds substantial curbside recycling.

Frank Fohr, on behalf of the Park in the City Committee, stressed that the municipal tap water is produced and distributed by Regional and local governments under strict Provincial standards and legislated controls. The elimination of the sale of bottled water will contribute to the reduction of plastic in landfills. Plastic water bottles can take up to 1000 years to degrade. Mr. Fohr clarified that what is proposed is not a ban on water bottles but elimination of their sale at City facilities.

Christopher Colaneri and Harish Aggarwal, members of the Mayor’s Youth Advisory Committee showed a short clip from a 2008 Good Morning America show about “Great Pacific Garbage patch”. The committee advised that they are in support of the staff report and recommendations and asked that Council approve the report. This is the first step in making a big difference in reducing the stress on our environment.

ORDERED on the motion of Councillor Ioannoni, seconded by Councillor Wing that the City of Niagara Falls eliminate the sale of plastic beverage bottles at City owned facilities, municipal buildings, recreation facilities and parks effective May 1, 2009; and

That staff develop a recommended implementation plan to increase the access to, and the availability of municipal water through public drinking fountains in municipal indoor and outdoor facilities, and outline the costs in the 2009 capital budget for the consideration of Council.

Carried Unanimously
Niagara Falls bans bottled water

Hamilton Spectator

Niagara Falls has voted to stop selling bottled water at city facilities despite last-minute lobbying efforts from Nestle Waters Canada.

Maude Barlow, a senior UN adviser on water and national chairperson of the Council of Canadians, commended the decision. She called it a new milestone in the international struggle against the commodification of water.

“When a city with the international profile of Niagara Falls recognizes this, and recognizes its responsibility to improve access to public water supplies, the days of bottled water are numbered across Canada and around the world,” said Barlow.

“This is about saying no to an irresponsible and redundant product,” says Stuart Trew, Ontario-Quebec Regional Organizer with the Council of Canadians, who was present for the vote.

He also said, “the bottled water industry has spent millions trying to convince Canadians to buy a product that we can get from our taps. The environmental impacts of bottling water, and the fact that many plastic bottles end up in the landfill, just add to the number of reasons Niagara Falls, and other cities across Canada, have voted to stop selling bottled water in municipal facilities.”

Local community group Park in the City played an important role in recommending the resolution.
Welcome to Frontenac County. Ottawa is an hour's drive to the northeast, Kingston a similar distance to the south. Algonquin Provincial Park lies to the northwest.

This beautiful lake is one of many in the centre of an ongoing uranium mining controversy. The 30,000 acres surrounding this lake in North Frontenac lie atop the edge of the Ottawa Valley's Canadian Shield. This land is often referred to as the “Land ‘O’ Lakes” tourist region.

With vast areas of Crown land, this region is also home to a healthy deer, wolf and moose population, and other rare or endangered species such as the blue lined skink and flying squirrel. Many residents live in the strip of forest and wetlands between Bon Echo and Sharbot Lake provincial parks. Many who live in the region have conservation in their bones, and local political issues, prior to this year, included deer management and spring bear hunting.

However, residents and tourists alike have recently learned that this area is also rich in uranium. A recent worldwide surge in nuclear power development has driven up the price of uranium, leading many companies to begin exploring the possibility of mining for the radioactive element.

Canada has a long history of uranium mining. Uranium mined by Sahtugot’ine (the Dene First Nation of Sahtu, or Great Bear Lake), who were hired by the government, was used to create the first atomic bombs, detonated on the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945. C.D. Howe, then Minister of Munitions and Supply in William Lyon Mackenzie King’s Liberal Government, issued a press statement saying, "It is a particular pleasure for me to announce that Canadian scientists have played an intimate part, and have been associated in an effective way with this great scientific development." Though an official warning was issued by the federal government in 1931, warning of the risks of handling uranium ore, mine workers were not informed of the risk.

In the 1960s, many of the Sahtugot’ine workers began to die of cancer of the lung, colon, and kidney. Studies of radioactive-based illnesses in the Elliot Lake region of northern Ontario, dating back to 1974, show the same correlation between uranium mining and carcinogenic diseases.
Today, Canada is the largest producer of uranium in the world, accounting for an estimated 27.9 per cent of world's uranium production. About 15 per cent of Canada's electricity comes from the country's 18 nuclear reactors.

Frontenac County is also home to a strong off-reserve Aboriginal population. About two months ago, when it was discovered that the Frontenac Ventures Development Corporation had begun staking Crown land for mining exploration, this community began protesting the potential mine.

Staking of land by hired prospectors has been done since settlers first arrived in Canada. Prospectors are allowed, according to the Ontario mining law of 1870, to enter any land, including that designated as Crown land or which is privately owned, and stake claims on the subsurface rights for future mining exploration. To date there have been 70 claims staked in North Frontenac alone.

The only obstacle to the 1870 mining law is a land claim filed by local Algonquins that dates back to 1772. Despite a “dispute” process set up by the Ministry of Mining and Northern Development, which allows land owners to disagree with the presence of prospecting stakes on their property, there is no process in place to deal with mining exploration on aboriginal land. Landowners in Frontenac County have little recourse when it comes to the mining company’s plans, which include digging trenches, cutting trees, pulling out core samples and releasing uranium into groundwater supplies and the air. As a result, many such residents have supported the cause of the aboriginal land claim.

The protest began on June 29, day of National protest by Aboriginal peoples across Canada. Members of the Ardoch Algonquin First Nation occupied Frontenac Ventures' base camp on Road 509, just north of the village of Sharbot Lake, Ontario.

If Frontenac Ventures has its way, it will drill for uranium samples which many say will spoil the land, air, and water for the thousands of local residents, cottagers and tourists. The company’s staked land encompasses a large part of North and Central Frontenac, a watershed region that is linked to Ottawa via the Mississippi River.

Once exposed to the open air, uranium dust can travel for thousands of kilometres. Uranium tailings (waste left behind after mining) are radioactive, and remain so for millions of years. The company plans to use one of the local lakes to "bury" the tailings left over from uranium exploration and mining. In this Land ‘O’ Lakes, each lake connects to the next, up to the Mississippi River, which connects to the Ottawa River.

To date, Parliament has made no statements about the mining project. Ontario Premier Dalton McGuinty, demonstrators say, has the power to call an immediate moratorium on uranium mining in Ontario. To the chagrin of many local residents, McGuinty has not spoken to the issue of uranium mining.
The Ardoch Algonquin First Nation and the Shabot Obaadijiwan First Nation, both local to Frontenac County, came together to present a united front against uranium mining. They say that the subsurface rights in the area (all land below the surface) belong to them via a land claim which reaches back to 1772. The mining company argues that the subsurface rights are Crown land, for which the law says mining is allowed by anyone who legally stakes it, according to the Ontario mining law of 1870. Frontenac Ventures has staked about 30,000 acres for mining, including both Crown land and privately owned land. The current mining law states that the company can stake subsurface land anywhere, no matter who owns it. The company’s exploration process includes the digging of trenches and holes, the cutting of trees and taking out any obstacles to the mining exploration, including roads owned by the township. So far there have been 70 land parcels of at least one hectare each staked in Frontenac county for the purposes of uranium exploration. Landowners in the area have no workable solution.

But there is one exception: an unsettled Aboriginal claim can supercede the mining law.

On June 29th, 2007, a day of National Aboriginal Protests, the Ardoch Algonquins began to occupy the site where Frontenac Ventures had set up its base camp. The base camp site, now the protest site, is north of Highway 7, up Road 509 about 10 kilometres, near the town of Sharbot Lake. The AAFNA and Shabot bands have remained at the site ever since, in protest of mining activity. On September 24, 2007, John Tory, leader of the Conservative party, announced via the media that as part of his new election platform he would like to see a “fine for anyone occupying land that is not owned by them, in the amount of $2500.00 per day.” It is assumed that he was referring in part to the Frontenac uranium protest, but again the issue was not brought to the forefront by the politicians themselves.

Locals who have had their land staked by the corporation, as well as supporters from many other areas, have been a presence outside the base camp gate. Only the aboriginal groups enter the base camp, which they claim is their land to do with as they please. Settlers, though they may own land, cannot make the same claim as the Algonquins to mining sites and subsurface land rights. The settlers and tourists alike are, for the majority, supporting the Algonquins in their protest; the only alternative is to adhere to the present mining laws, which have not been revised since their inception in 1870. Both the Algonquins and the settlers have been attempting to have their voices heard in Parliament; they want a moratorium of this outdated mining law.
The Canadian Shield is in the immediate vicinity of cities lying to the south of Highway 7 (Kington, Belleville, Frontenac), as well as Ottawa. Many protesters and locals are asking: how small does Ottawa think its backyard is?

Locals who support the Algonquins have camped at the site or have dropped by to show support. They have brought food, water and fuel to the protesters. The temporary camp put up by the Algonquins is becoming permanent. Efforts are now underway to ensure that, if necessary, the Algonquin protesters can remain at the site throughout the winter season. Donations of food and money for legal fees are being collected toward this goal.

Anti-uranium signs dot the tree-filled landscape in Frontenac County. The issue is regularly reported in the local paper, The Frontenac News. Some papers in Kingston and Ottawa have also covered the mining controversy. Greenpeace and the Christian Peacemaker Team have joined in the cause. Most recently Elizabeth May, leader of the Green Party, has spoken out against uranium mining in Ontario, and in support of this protest. A judge from the provincial Superior Court in Kingston has served two injunctions, telling the Ontario Provincial Police (OPP) to remove protesters and supporters if they deem removal to be necessary. The OPP have been seen in the area regularly, but have yet to make any moves toward removing protesters. The OPP claim that their stance as moderators and peacekeepers has not allowed them to arrest or remove any protesters to date.

The Algonquins have told the court that they will not participate in the injunction orders. Citing Ipperwash and Oka as examples, the Algonquins state that injunctions do not take the place of discussion. They have invited the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs to come and speak to them. As of this writing, this visit has not happened. Frontenac Ventures Corp. has filed papers to sue the Algonquins and their supporters for $77 million dollars in "projected losses." They have also offered the government a way out of this issue: The mining company is willing to sell their staked land and business prospects in the area to the government. The starting price? $80 million. The Algonquins are planning to counter-sue both the mining company and the government for misuse of traditional lands.

The aim of the peaceful protest, demonstrators say, is to remain in the mining base camp until Dalton McGuinty calls a moratorium on uranium mining in Ontario. Many local councils have already passed resolutions against uranium mining through their own channels. When Ottawa finally makes its move, those opposed to uranium mining worry that it may be all rain or all shine for Frontenac County, for Ottawa, for Kingston and all of the other towns and cities within uranium dust-blowing distance.
Update: On Saturday, September 22, two canoes were launched from the head of the Mississippi River in Ardoch, Ontario. They will travel to the Parliament buildings in Ottawa in order to demonstrate that the water systems connect and that, for the safety of all residents within air and water distance of the potential uranium mine, an immediate solution must be found.

*Megan Hughes is the author of* Me and My Bike: An Ontario motojournal
Queen’s professor jailed for protest

Ardoch Algonquin aboriginals oppose uranium mining on land involved in claim dispute

BY JANE SWITZER, ASSISTANT NEWS EDITOR

Supporters rally in Napanee to protest uranium mining. (Erin Flegg)

A Queen’s professor is in jail for continuing to protest uranium exploration on disputed land.

Robert Lovelace is a former Ardoch Algonquin First Nations chief and teaches Devs 220 and Devs 221 at Queen’s. He also teaches at Sir Sanford Fleming College.

Lovelace has been part of a protest against the Oakville-based mining company Frontenac Ventures Corporation that began on June 28, 2007. Members of the Ardoch Algonquin First Nation and the Shabot Obaa’dijiwan Algonquin living in the Ardoch area believe they hold unceded interest in Crown lands to which Frontenac Ventures has laid claim, and that the provincial government should not have granted prospecting rights without consulting them.

They and some of their neighbours also fear that exploratory drilling will contaminate the area’s groundwater. Consequently, protesters set up a camp on the site near Sharbot Lake last June and prevented the mining exploration company from working on the site.

In a statement on the Ardoch Algonquin website, issued last June, Lovelace said Frontenac Ventures purchased the land, which is traditional Ardoch Algonquin Land, without their consent. “Frontenac Ventures Corporation should not have been granted claims or staking rights on our traditional lands without prior notification by the Ministry of
Mining and Northern Development, and they should not have been allowed to purchase our lands without our consent, as we are the only autonomous authority within those lands,” Lovelace wrote.

On Feb. 15 at Kingston’s Superior Court, Justice Douglas Cunningham found Lovelace guilty of contempt of court for failing to obey an injunction issued September 27, 2007 ordering him to six months in jail and fined $25,000.

Lovelace’s co-defendant, Ardoch Algonquin chief Paula Sherman was also found guilty of contempt of court and was fined $15,000, but waved her six-month jail sentence by agreeing to abide by the injunction. The injunction prohibits Sherman from participating in, or advocating others to participate in a blockade. It requires her to recommend or use best efforts to persuade other people to also obey the court orders.

Rachel Kelleher, ArtSci ’10, is enrolled in the Devs 221 class Lovelace taught up until Feb. 13.

“As a professor he’s very engaging and compassionate,” she said. “He’s very encouraging of students who may have a different perspective.”

Bonita Lawrence, a professor from York University and friend of Lovelace, has taken over teaching the class.

“She had an understanding with him prior to his sentencing that if he should be sentenced she would come in and take over his class,” she said. “She’s very knowledgeable about the situation and encourages open discussion.”

Kelleher, who was present at Lovelace’s sentencing, said she thought the sentence was too harsh.

“I felt outraged at the fact that a professor I held in such high regard was being treated like a common criminal when he was standing up for what he thought was just.”

Ardoch Algonquin First Nations lawyer Christopher Reid said Lovelace’s sentence wasn’t a surprise.

“It’s harsh, but it’s not unexpected,” he said. “Although it’s at the high end, it’s not completely outside of the range.”

Lovelace is being held in the Central East Correctional Centre in Lindsay, ON. There’s no guarantee Lovelace will be released from the correctional centre before his six month sentence is up.

“Even if we do appeal, they won’t likely let him out unless he’s willing to sign an undertaking saying he won’t return to protesting,” he said. “When I spoke to him [on Tuesday], he said he’s not prepared to do that.” Reid said part of the problem is that it’s almost impossible to reconcile Canadian and Algonquin law.

“This case is an example of that,” he said. “[The Algonquins] feel like they’re in a foreign justice system, and can’t convey to the court why they feel it’s a violation of human rights. … [Lovelace] testified to in court that it was his understanding through talks with elders that uranium is something that should stay in the ground and shouldn’t be
Frontenac Ventures lawyer Neal Smitheman said he thinks Lovelace’s sentence was fair, given the circumstances. “Mr. Lovelace was given the opportunity to purge his contempt,” he said. “I think it was a fair sentence, and it allows Mr. Lovelace to reconsider his decision.”

Smitheman said Canadian law should apply to all Canadian citizens. “The trick is to find a way to accommodate different cultures, but in order to have peace, order and good government, which is the foundation of our society, there can really only be one law that the court can impose on the citizens, and that’s what happened in this case.”

Smitheman said he found it odd that Algonquin law has a specific law against uranium mining.

Smitheman said that, because Lovelace refused to obey Canadian law, going to court was the only way to resolve the issue.

“That may sound harsh, but those who obey the law should be able to expect protection of the law,” he said. “Those who don’t will have to expect punishment. That’s the basis of a liberal democracy.”

Smitheman said he thinks disobeying laws you disagree with isn’t the right way to resolve legal issues.

“If you do that, that’s the road to anarchy,” he said. “You may have some sympathy for those who do not support the mining act or having uranium mined, and those are all legitimate concerns, but to refuse to obey a court order is simply not acceptable in a free and democratic society.”

Vice-Principal (Academic) Patrick Deane said the University doesn’t involve itself in political issues and has no official stance on the Lovelace case.

“We do, however, believe very firmly in freedom of speech and expression, and it is the right of members of our society to state their opposition to what is going on and to do what they believe is necessary,” he said. If a professor has to leave his or her job because of imprisonment, Deane said the University takes into account the level at which their absence impinges on their work before looking into terminating the professor’s job.

“In the case of Lovelace, he’s very well known to be a very professional and effective instructor,” Deane said. “Our view is that he is unable to fulfill his duties here [while imprisoned], and that’s something we accept. We recognize he has made provisions for his students, and there’s no reason at all at the end of his term for his imprisonment he couldn’t come back and resume his work.”

Although the University administration isn’t taking a side on the issue, Deane said he encourages discourse between students and faculty.

“In this particular instance, the University would strongly recommend that issues raised by this case be discussed and considered by the academic community for the interests in arriving at the most informed conclusion.”
Frontenac Ventures still beating the bushes for funding

Written by Jeff Green

Frontenac Ventures Corporation has not given up on their uranium exploration project in North Frontenac Township, but finding funding for the next phase of drilling is a persistent obstacle. When contacted, Frontenac Ventures President George White said that all of the potential funding sources are coming from overseas, particularly Asia, and “when you are dealing with India and China, nothing moves quickly.”

White also pointed out that finding funding has been difficult for even some extremely rich new uranium deposits that have been located in Saskatchewan, which is the source of most of the world’s uranium. Among those new deposits is one that White described as “a thousand times as concentrated as ours”.

The market price for uranium is just over $40 US this week, about 1/3 what it was when Frontenac Ventures commenced the drilling program that sparked a protest and occupation of their exploration headquarters at the Robertsville mine three years ago this month.

Nonetheless, a teleconference court hearing took place on May 31, wherein Frontenac Ventures asked Justice Cunningham to renew the warrants he had issued late in the summer of 2007, warrants that compelled the Ontario Provincial Police to enforce a court injunction barring protesters from the vicinity of the Robertsville mine.

According to George White, the warrants have been re-issued by Cunningham as a matter of course on other occasions, but this time the OPP objected to some of the conditions and a further hearing is being scheduled for early July.

But warrants or not, Frontenac Ventures does not appear to have any plans to re-start their uranium exploration program at this time.
(BLM 3.2) - Question Sheet

1. Who are the different stakeholders, people or groups that have an interest or are impacted by events described in the series of texts? *(Try and also think of stakeholders that might not be mentioned in the texts)*

2. What interests are stakeholders defending? What do they have to gain, or lose? *(Think outside the box, try and analyze the information and come up with answers to this question that might not be in the text)*

3. Choose two stakeholders with differing interests and summarize their position on the events described in the texts.

4. Is there information missing from the available texts that could help you get a clearer picture of the events? What information is missing?

**BONUS: Questions on media**

A. What factors can influence the way a journalist/reporter would report an event?
(BLM 3.3) Teacher guide and answer sheet

Note #1: These answers aren't all explicitly expressed in the texts, much reading between the lines and "imagining" needs to be done. This might be more difficult for some people and I wouldn't expect anyone to get all the answers right, but together they can maybe piece together most of it! I would encourage them to think outside the box on this one.

Note #2: Some of the answers are also open to interpretation such as "the government of Nova Scotia is looking out for the interests of Nova Scotians" can be open to debate depending on issues at hand or opportunism, reputational risk, etc.

Note #3: These aren't all the possible answers, but only some possible answers. Also, important to make a different between what they interests "should be" and what they are. (ex: it could be argued that government should prioritize public interest, but it can sometimes, or often, seem like that is not what it is doing)

Event #1

Question 1 & 2
- Government of Nova Scotia: Being elected, reputation, interests of people in Nova Scotia, public interest, financial health of the province, jobs
- Mi'kmaq nation: The interests of their community, the land they live on, the environment, their values
- Residents: From land they live on, water, respect for First Nations, to jobs, democracy, etc.(most answers are good - obviously varies from one person to another, from one community to another)
- Industry (Fracking industry, CAPP, etc.): Their business, making money, getting product out of the ground, getting permit from government
- Environmental groups (Ecology Action Centre, etc.): Protect water, fight climate change

Question 3
(see texts for information; should choose stakeholders whose positions are well defined in the texts)

Question 4
(Open to interpretation, can be small pieces of information or large ones. Examples below)
- More information about the review panel
- More information about the position of the environmentalists

Event #2

Question 1 & 2
- City of Niagara Falls (City Council): Public Interest, expenses, opinion of its constituents
- Nestle Waters Canada & the bottled water industry: Reputation of their product and company, selling bottled water, captive markets
- Environmental and social justice groups: Environmental concerns, water protection, climate change, how expensive bottled water is, waste management concerns, regulation of water, etc.
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- **Residents and consumers**: Good quality drinking water, good access to water, how expensive it is, etc. (most answers are good - obviously varies from one person to another, from one community to another)

**Question 3**
(see texts for information; should choose stakeholders whose positions are well defined in the texts)

**Question 4**
(Open to interpretation, can be small pieces of information or large ones. Examples below)
- More information about the position of environmental and social justice groups (omitted here)
- More information on events leading up to this decision
- More information on what other cities have done or are doing

**Event #3**

**Question 1 & 2**
- **Ardoch Algonquin, Shabot Obaadijiiwan First Nation**: Protect the land, their tradition, interests of their community, sovereignty over decisions that affect them and their lands (i.e. rights to the land), protect the water, etc.
- **Frontenac Ventures**: open up mine, make money, attract shareholders
- **Courts**: Uphold various parts of the existing law, charter, etc.
- **Non-indigenous residents that support the Algonquin**: Protect their homes and water, support Algonquin opposed to the uranium mine
- **Government of Ontario**: Financial interests, public interest, reputation, re-election, etc.

**Question 3**
(see texts for information; should choose stakeholders whose positions are well defined in the texts)

**Question 4**
(Open to interpretation, can be small pieces of information or large ones. Examples below)
- More information on the events leading to arrest and after the arrest
- More information on the company and the government position
Activity 2 - Water: Commodity or Commons?

**Learning Goals:** Explore different definitions and ways water is viewed, used and treated in the world, and forge an opinion about water in our society.

**Curriculum Outcomes Targeted (Gr 10 Civics and Citizenship, 2013)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strand B – Civic Awareness</th>
<th>Strand C – Civic Engagement and Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B1. Civic Issues, Democratic Values:</strong> describe beliefs and values associated with democratic citizenship in Canada, and explain how they are related to civic action and to one’s position on civic issues</td>
<td><strong>C2. Inclusion and Participation:</strong> assess ways in which people express their perspectives on issues of civic importance and how various perspectives, beliefs, and values are recognized and represented in communities in Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B1.1 describe some civic issues of local, national, and/or global significance and compare the perspectives of different groups on selected issues</strong></td>
<td><strong>C2.1 analyse ways in which various beliefs, values, and perspectives are represented in their communities and assess whether all perspectives are represented or are valued equally</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:** Definitions and statements for four concepts (privatization of water, public management of water, commodification of water, and water as a commons) are presented to students. Students must associate the statements with the definition. Subsequent to that activity, students are invited to develop an opinion about how we should handle water in our society.

**Time Required:** 60 minutes (30 minutes per activity)

**Materials & Preparation:**

- **Materials:** Print out the Activity sheet (BLM 3.4); The definitions can be projected on a screen.
- **Activity:** The teacher should familiarize with the activity (BLM 3.4) and the answers (BLM 3.5)

**Teaching Strategy:**

This lesson is divided into two activities as described below

- **Activity 1 – Politics of the Control of Water: What’s What?** (see BLM 3.4)
  - It can be helpful to review the definitions as a class ahead of the activity.
  - This activity can be done individually or in small groups. We also suggest finishing the activity by reviewing answers and answering questions in a larger group can be helpful.

- **Activity 2 – Dealing with water**
  - Answer the following question:
    - Drawing from, but not limiting yourself to, some of the concepts defined in the previous activity, explain in your own words how your community or how our society should behave with regards to water considering that water can be polluted and is available in limited quantity.

**EXTRA:**

- **WATCH:** [Re-Municipalisation video](#) (5 minutes)
- **WATCH:** [The Story of Bottled Water](#) (8 minutes)
- **CONTRIBUTE:** [Great Lakes Commons Map](#) (Read and share stories)
(BLM 3.4) – Activity sheet 1: Politics of the Control of Water: What’s What?

Definitions:

1) **Public Water Services**: When a water system (treatment and distribution of water and wastewater) for a group of houses, town or city is the responsibility of a public body or government, often a municipality or City. Expenses for building, maintenance and operations are covered through municipal taxes or a separate water fee collected by the same government.

2) **Private Water Services**: When a water system (treatment and distribution of water and wastewater) for a group of houses, town or city is the responsibility of a private company that collects fees directly from people and companies who need and use the water or sometimes from a government body like a city.

3) **Water as a commons**: We call a commons what we share, inherit and pass on to future generations, the elements that everyone depends on to live, e.g. air, water, land and forests. We also call “cultural commons” anything that is a collective creation, e.g. art, film, literature, radio, music. And finally we call a social commons a concept that includes equity and guarantees intergenerational access to health care, education and social security. A commons is not owned by private interests or individuals but held collectively. In the case of water as a commons, water is seen as something everyone should have access to for their basic needs, but also everyone’s responsibility. Water is outside the purview of the market (i.e. can’t be bought or sold).

4) **Water as a commodity**: A commodity is a good (ex: wheat, oil, water) or service that can be traded or exchanged in the marketplace for another commodity or money. This means that a monetary value is put on the good.

**Statements:**

Which of the four concepts defined above explain best or can be linked to what is happening in the statements below?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Blue collar workers are responsible for managing the treatment and distribution of drinking water for a city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Lake Ontario Waterkeeper is an organization that is fighting to protect the Lake Ontario watershed, which includes all tributaries that drain into Lake Ontario.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>A city government owns all infrastructures (structure &amp; equipment) used to treat its drinking water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>A company is hired by a city to treat and distribute water to its residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Selling and Buying Bottled Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>A town in India is running out of water because a bottled water plant dug a deeper well and is taking the entire town’s water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Local environment group is organizing a spring shoreline clean-up for a river.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>Rural residents in Ontario are seeing the level of water in their wells drop because a local golf course or mine is taking too much water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Communities in India started a campaign called “Quit India Coca-Cola” to reclaim control over their water where Coca-Cola plants have been causing many problems, including overusing water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td>In 2008, the city of Paris France decides to re-municipalize its water services after two decades of mismanagement by 3 private companies, meaning that the municipal government will now be in charge of managing the water services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.</td>
<td>In 2009, the Government of Canada introduces policies to encourage the management of municipal water services by water companies on contracts of 25 to 30 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A. Blue collar workers are responsible for managing the treatment and distribution of drinking water for a city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>B. Lake Ontario Waterkeeper is an organization that is fighting to protect the Lake Ontario watershed, which includes all tributaries that drain into Lake Ontario.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>C. A city government owns all infrastructures (buildings and equipment) required to treat its drinking water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>D. A company is hired by a city to treat and distribute water to its residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>E. Selling and Buying Bottled Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>F. A town in India is running out of water because a bottled water plant dug a deeper well and is taking the entire town’s water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>G. Local environment group is organizing a spring shoreline clean-up for a river.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>H. Rural residents in Ontario are seeing the level of water in their wells drop because a local golf course or mine is taking too much water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I. Communities in India started a campaign called “Quit India Coca-Cola” to reclaim control over their water where Coca-Cola plants have been causing many problems, including overusing water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>J. In 2008, the city of Paris France decides to re-municipalize its water services after two decades of mismanagement by 3 private companies, meaning that the municipal government will now be in charge of managing the water services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>K. In 2009, the Government of Canada introduces policies to encourage the management of municipal water services by water companies on contracts of 25 to 30 years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activity 3 - Personal Reflection – Water Democracy & Action

**Learning Goals:** Reflect about concepts of democracy and active participation in society in relation to water

**Curriculum Outcomes Targeted (Gr 10 Civics and Citizenship, 2013)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strand B – Civic Awareness</th>
<th>Strand C – Civic Engagement and Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B1. Civic Issues, Democratic Values:</strong> describe beliefs and values associated with democratic citizenship in Canada, and explain how they are related to civic action and to one's position on civic issues</td>
<td><strong>C2. Inclusion and Participation:</strong> assess ways in which people express their perspectives on issues of civic importance and how various perspectives, beliefs, and values are recognized and represented in communities in Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B1.1</strong> describe some civic issues of local, national, and/or global significance and compare the perspectives of different groups on selected issues</td>
<td><strong>C2.1</strong> analyse ways in which various beliefs, values, and perspectives are represented in their communities and assess whether all perspectives are represented or are valued equally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:** Have students reflect about a few questions and write down answers to each question. Questions relate to water, democracy, and responsibility to water.

**Time Required:** 30-60 minutes

**Materials & Preparation:**

- **Materials:** Show questions on a screen or print out questions on a paper to hand out to students (BLM 3.5)

**Teaching Strategy:**

1. The teacher will explain the tasks of the activity
   a. **Activity:** 3 options (choice of student or teacher) - The reflection should address some (a few) or all of the guiding questions in BLM 3.5.
      i. The student can choose to write one page of text that explores their relationship to water
      ii. The student can write a one page poem accompanied by a short contextualization or explanation (what is the poem talking about).
      iii. The student can make a visual representation accompanied by a short contextualization or explanation. Students must be conscious of time constraints.
   b. **Wrap-up:** Sharing the reflection with classmates. 3 options, class can vote or teacher can decide:
      i. Everyone share the reflection by briefly talking about their work in front of the class
      ii. The class is split in small groups of about 5 people and each person in the group shares their reflection each their turn
      iii. A few volunteers share their work in front of the class
(BLM 3.5) – Guiding Questions for Activity

1. What is your **relationship** to water in your community (school, neighbourhood, town, etc.)?

2. What is your **responsibility** to water in your community (school, neighbourhood, town, etc.)?

3. What does it mean to be an active citizen or active participant in our society?

4. What are reasons why someone might take action to protect water in their community (school, neighbourhood, town, etc.)?

5. **Would you work with others in your community to protect water?** Can you describe situations where you might or could do this?