

Remarks to T.O. Board of Health

Good afternoon!

My name is Janet McNeill.

I'm a mother & grandmother, & have been a community activist since my children - now in their mid-30s - were very young.

So. More than 30 years of activism.

I'm also Coordinator of the Durham Nuclear Awareness - DNA - group, this since 2012.

Most of my activist energy has been on nuclear issues since 2010, 'though I began paying attention to the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission - CNSC - back in 2006.

As you might imagine, in 30 years of activism, I've cottoned on to a thing or 2 about how things really work in the world.

Please note, I've worked on a variety of issues:

- Water
- Waste
- Pesticides
- Cancer prevention
- Energy conservation
- Lead &
- Climate change

Not just nukes.

In the DNA group, our focus is primarily on nuclear emergency planning. DNA was calling for better nuclear emergency planning way back in the late 1980s, & the truth is, things have barely changed.

Ontario's nuclear emergency plans are ... well, I guess I need to be a bit diplomatic here They are very poor indeed, in the opinion of a good many of us.

So that's where much of our group's energy is focused.

One thing that has become clear to me over time is how very multi-jurisdictional nuclear activities are.

The feds license all nuclear facilities & also play a major role in emergency planning.

The Province decides whether or not we'll continue to rely on nuclear energy, & also has a huge role in nuclear emergency planning, through OFMEM - the Office of the Fire Marshal & Emergency Management in the Ministry of Community Safety & Correctional Services.

Municipal governments also bear emergency planning responsibilities, & most importantly, municipalities are where the rubber really hits the road. If there is a nuclear emergency of any kind (if there is an emergency of ANY kind), it is in the municipality - the community - where the impacts will be felt, & will have to be dealt with.

I've learned over the past 12 years (since I became a CNSC watcher) that we are supposed to rely on & place our trust in Canada's nuclear "regulator" - & also, that it is unwise to do so.

I say this as a person who has by now attended somewhere between 15 & 20 CNSC hearings (all over the province) and personally intervened in at least 10 since 2010.

2016 was an outstanding year for losing trust in the CNSC, if one had not already done so.

In early 2016 a coalition of groups wrote to the Prime Minister calling for a major overhaul of the Nuclear Safety & Control Act.

Then, a group of CNSC staff whistleblowers revealed some shocking information about how things really work at the CNSC, with tribunal members not receiving full & complete information about safety matters at nuclear stations

& then in the Fall, Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development Julie Gelfand revealed results of a CNSC audit & likened improper CNSC safety inspections to a plane taking off without going through a safety checklist.

I can provide documentation of all these things, & would be happy to do so. There is an October 2016 posting on the DNA Web site that lays this all out & provides links to all the relevant documents & media reports.

I need to move onto the health issue!

HEALTH DEAL

Way back in 1959, there was a deal that was signed by the IAEA - the global nuclear regulator AND promoter (Yes! Bit of a problem there, hmmm?)

& the WHO - World Health Organization.

This deal represented an agreement whereby these 2 agencies would cooperate very closely so as not to step on one another's toes, essentially.

I have a copy of the deal here with me. It used to be on the IAEA Web site, but seems to have disappeared. Just one quote from it here:

QUOTE: Whenever either organization proposes to initiate a program or activity on a subject in which the other organization has or may have a substantial interest, the first party shall consult the other with a view to adjusting the matter by mutual agreement.

This deal has effectively choked off research by public health agencies into the health impacts of radioactivity / radioactive emissions / contamination & accidents ever since 1959. This has had very widespread ramifications indeed, which I don't have time to touch on in these 5 minutes.

All this seemingly perhaps unrelated rambling is to say that I strongly advise you not to trust "the authorities" as regards possible health impacts from the nuclear facility located at 1025 Lansdowne Ave. in Toronto.

And merely receive the report for information

As I believe that is usually a euphemism for laying it aside & forgetting about it.

I think you should do a little more digging.

As members of the Board of Health for the City of Toronto, I think you have a greater responsibility than that.

I'd be happy to answer any questions you might have, or go into more depth on some of the issues I've raised.

I've also created a handout with some links, so you can check into these things on your own.

For sure, I can tell you that these more than 30 years of activism have taught me that things are never as simple as they first appear to be, & that is always wise to do some more digging. My motto is #QuestionEverything.

I could say more too about last year's provincial government audit, & revelations about things that go on at OFMEM, the agency that looks after nuclear emergency planning. (I have the audit here with me.)

But my time is up!

FOR BOARD OF HEALTH MEMBERS

Nuclear Health? Pssst... Well-kept secret deal

July 2015 DNA posting with information about the IAEA / WHO health deal

(A copy of the deal is linked to in the posting)

<https://www.durhamnuclearawareness.com/blog/2015/07/23/nuclear-health>

Nukes. 'Perfect Storm' A-Brewing?

October 2016 DNA posting about whistleblower, audit & a few other things

(includes link to the letter itself, the audit & related media items)

<https://www.durhamnuclearawareness.com/blog/2016/10/14/nukes-perfect-storm-a-brewing>

DNA Submissions on recent Pickering licensing hearing

(DNA commissioned a poll that showed 93% of those surveyed want nuclear emergency planning for a Fukushima-scale accident. While 81% of those surveyed have KI pills, 87% want the KI pill pre-distribution radius expanded.)

<http://www.nuclearsafety.gc.ca/eng/the-commission/hearings/cmd/pdf/cmd18-h6/CMD18-H6-56.pdf>

<http://www.nuclearsafety.gc.ca/eng/the-commission/hearings/cmd/pdf/cmd18-h6/CMD18-H6-56A.pdf>

Note: actual remarks at the hearing referenced the IAEA-WHO deal.

See below the disclaimer that accompanied our submission:

Disclaimer This submission is not in any way an endorsement of the CNSC hearing process, its credibility or independence of the CNSC. On the contrary, DNA (Durham Nuclear Awareness) endorses the calls on the current federal government for major changes to the system of nuclear governance in Canada.

Until true independence of the CNSC can be established through a legislative review, with changes in CNSC senior management and by appointing a new CNSC president, and until such time as there have been changes to CNSC rules of procedure to allow for cross-examination and testing of evidence, we do not believe CNSC hearings can be relied upon to provide trustworthy assessments of nuclear risks in Canada.

Accompanying this disclaimer are several items which back up our contention that a major overhaul of the CNSC is required before trust in the agency's independence and reliability can be established:

- Letter to the Prime Minister (March 2016) calling for overhaul of the NSCA
- Whistleblower letter from CNSC staff (May 2016)
- Federal Audit report (October 2016)
- Letter establishing that CNSC has never refused a license request (February 2017)

“There has not existed the slightest shred of meaningful evidence that the entire intervention process in nuclear energy is anything more than the most callous of charades and frauds.” – *Dr. John Gofman, M.D., Ph.D.* in *“Irrevery” – An Irreverent, Illustrated View of Nuclear Power*