



**GREAT LAKES UNITED**

June 16, 1992

The Hon. Ruth Grier  
The Hon. Ed Philip  
The Hon. Bud Wildman  
The Hon. Shelley Martel

Dear

**Re: Zero Discharge is Necessary to Achieve a Healthy and Sustainable Great Lakes Forest Industry**

---

Great Lakes United (GLU), a coalition of two hundred member organizations in Canada and the United States, urges you to continue to pursue zero discharge of persistent toxic chemicals in the Municipal Industrial Strategy for Abatement (MISA) regulations for the pulp and paper industry. GLU's membership includes environmental, conservation and sportsmen organizations, educators, municipalities and a very strong trade union membership. For the last ten years we have campaigned for public participation in regulatory reform to eliminate the discharge of persistent toxic substances in the Great Lakes. In 1987, our organization was invited by the governments of both Canada and the U.S. to join their teams to renegotiate The Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement. Since this strengthened 1987 Agreement, there has been a growing recognition in all sectors in the Great Lakes Basin of the need to implement zero discharge and pollution prevention strategies. Your government's reorientation of the MISA regulations away from best available technology controls focus to a broader pollution prevention emphasis gives us many more tools, means and opportunities to achieve the stated zero discharge goal of MISA.

Recently, in an unprecedented move Great Lakes scientists have publicly called for implementation of zero discharge to limit risks they have concluded are impacting humans as well as wildlife populations in the Great Lakes.

The movement for zero discharge can no longer be seen as an environmental agenda. The Sixth Biennial Report of the International Joint Commission is unambiguous about the necessity to ban chlorine from the pulp and paper process, create timetables for achieving zero discharge and the designation of the most pristine of the Great Lakes, Lake Superior as a zero discharge demonstration area.




Any backsliding in Ontario's MISA program away from zero discharge and pollution prevention would put Ontario even further behind other Great Lakes jurisdictions. The pulp and paper industry should be subject to the same regulatory requirements as the other sectors regulated by MISA. Indeed, there is increasing belief that the only way to ensure that the integrity of the Great Lake ecosystem is protected is to have uniform basin-wide standards.

Great Lakes United's members have recognized that the transition from a pollution control regulatory regime to pollution prevention and zero discharge regulations could cause hardships if it is mismanaged. We have created a labour/environment taskforce to look at zero discharge issues and their impacts on labour. We believe that a zero discharge implementation strategy should not solely be the responsibility of the Ministry of the Environment. It will be incumbent on the Ministries of Industry Trade and Technology, Northern Development, Natural Resources and Skills Development to help plan the complex transition program to convert pulp and paper into a non-polluting industry. A multi-ministry plan which includes provision for participation by labour and environmental groups could, we feel, result in a zero discharge implementation strategy with achievable timetables which minimizes job disruption. This program should include technical assistance grants for toxic-use reduction audits and changes to industrial processes and state of the art equipment, and retraining programs for workers, as well as new pollution prevention job creation programs. Worker compensation and economic protection packages must be part of these plans to give security during transition.

Great Lakes United would urge you not to waste time resisting widely endorsed zero discharge implementation. Please consider instead when and how to achieve a healthy and clean pulp and paper industry. We have included a package of additional material for your use which include GLU taskforce's recommendations on zero discharge strategies, Lake Superior, banning chlorine in pulp and paper processing and worker protection. As well, we have included a special issue on pulp and paper from our Pollution Prevention Bulletin.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you about the necessity of zero discharge implementation.

Yours truly,



Sarah Miller  
Vice-President  
Great Lakes United  
c/o 517 College Street  
Suite 401  
Toronto, Ontario  
M6G 4A2

# BULLETIN OF POLLUTION PREVENTION

no. 3

Great Lakes United—a binational coalition for the Great Lakes/St. Lawrence ecosystem

fall 1991

## In the Beginning: Zero Discharge in Pulp and Paper

by Gord Perks, Greenpeace

If the zero discharge effort is ever to make serious inroads in the Great Lakes Basin, it will probably start in the region's pulp and paper mills. Paper-making is the largest source of persistent toxic chemicals directly discharged to the Lakes. These chemicals are almost entirely organochlorines, which are created by the use of chlorine compounds to bleach processed wood, called *pulp*, to make it whiter.

Little change has taken place in Basin pulp and paper mills so far. The E.B. Eddy mill in Espanola, Ontario, has announced plans for a pilot project that will substitute ozone, a form of oxygen, for chlorine in the bleaching process. The mill was a pioneer in the 1970s of a process that bleaches pulp with oxygen in a first stage to reduce the need for chlorine in later stages.

The Red Rock mill in Domtar, Ontario, which is financially troubled, has been running tests on bleaching with hydrogen peroxide instead of chlorine. However, little of Red Rock's pulp production is bleached, although, because it is mixed with other, unbleached pulps, the bleached output is a crucial component of the mill's overall operation. At 50 tonnes a day the mill's bleached production scarcely compares to the many pulp mills that bleach 1000 tonnes daily. Accordingly, the Red Rock mill may not be able to find economies of scale for the new technology. Environment Canada listed the mill as a zero discharge project at the 1991 International Joint Commission's Biennial Meeting.

There is only slightly more promising news elsewhere in North America. The Howe Sound Pulp and Paper mill at Port Mellon, British Columbia, has installed a system that allows operators to omit the use of chlorine dioxide. This compound is rapidly replacing pure chlorine as the pulp-makers' bleach of choice because it produces fewer organochlorine by-products. Howe Sound's first batch of chlorine-free pulp was produced in late October for sale to companies in Germany, where demand for chlorine-free papers is becoming very strong. A Union Camp mill currently under construction in Franklin, Virginia, will allow use of zero discharge production processes. Both projects will provide an example for Great Lakes pulpers.

The disappointing progress toward zero discharge in the Great Lakes pulp and paper industry as a whole is distinct from its progress in lowering its level of discharges. Great Lakes mills have reduced their collective release of persistent toxic substances by almost half from an estimated high of 600 million pounds a year in 1986.

However, this progress can obscure the crucial issue in pulp and paper toxic pollution: there is no need for any organochlorine discharges because there is no economic or technical need for chlorine in bleaching.

Much of the improvement in the industry's discharge levels is due to investment in oxygen and other "pre-bleaching" technology. This investment will be useful for eventual zero-discharge production. The industry is also making large investments in end-

of-pipe discharge-reduction technologies such as the construction of "aerated lagoons." The lagoons substantially improve the quality of effluent for a number of elements of pulp and paper-making discharge, but estimates of their ability to reduce discharged organochlorines range from a mere 20 percent to a still-insufficient 50 percent. In any case, only one third of that reduction is truly eliminated, in the form of conversion to relatively neutral salts. The other two thirds is merely transferred to air, via evaporation, and to land, via absorption into lagoon sludge, which is eventually landfilled, land "spread" or incinerated.

For forty years the most significant (and organochlorine-producing) segment of the pulp and paper industry—"kraft" pulping, which accounts for almost 75 percent of Great Lakes pulp production—has marketed its product on the basis of virtually one quality: brightness. Kraft pulpers are extremely reluctant to jump into chlorine-free production because all chlorine-substitution processes produce less-bright pulp. There are a number of methods available to minimize and even eliminate this problem, and European makers are fully embracing the effort to do so, but the North American industry is stubbornly resisting pressure to join them.

This is very unfortunate, since it is so unnecessary. Because the European example has been unconvincing to both pulp and paper makers and higher levels of government on this continent, Greenpeace tired an econo-

my to analyze the economic impacts of implementing chlorine-free processes in Great Lakes pulp and paper mills. The study, currently in the last stages of review by professional peers, concludes that there would be no net economic harm to the industry. Some mills would be shut, but this would be the result of ongoing concentration in the industry, the trend toward integrated mills, and the current marginal status of many mills. On the plus side, the industry would be in a good posi-

tion to move wholesale into a combination of hydrogen peroxide and "enzyme" pulp bleaching. Although it is chlorine-free, biobleaching, as enzyme bleaching is also called, has not received endorsement by environmentalists (and is not likely to) because it involves genetic engineering. There is no way to know in advance the effect of discharging to water hundreds of thousands of pounds of man-made biological chemicals designed to attack the common organic structures

found in wood. With other processes already developed or in development with environmental effects that are both known and treatable, there is no need to take risks with genetically engineered materials.

### European Market

Leaving aside the more substantial interest in environmental affairs on the part of European governments, the principal reason for Europe's progress toward zero-discharge pulp and paper making lies in a change in attitude by the continent's paper consumers. For



The Proctor & Gamble and James River pulp and paper mills, Green Bay, Wisconsin, 1987

example, virtually the whole of the gigantic German magazine publishing industry has asked suppliers to provide a chlorine-free version of the light weight, coated paper used in slick magazines like *Time* magazine here in the United States. Germany is even planning import restrictions on chlorine-bleached pulp.

### European Advances

The pace of movement toward zero discharge in North America's pulp and paper industry has been snail-like, but tremendous progress has been made in Europe. Its example is pointing the way for more sweeping changes on this continent. Sweden's ASPA mill and Spain's ENCA operation already produce non-chlorine-bleached kraft pulp acceptable for almost every use. Those plants are just the tip of the iceberg. Virtually the entire European pulp and paper industry is in the process of long-term planning for conversion to chlorine-free production.

The ASPA mill pre-bleaches pulp with oxygen and bleaches with hydrogen peroxide in a process, known as the Lignox system, that produces no organochlorine by-products. The mill's design allows further bleaching with chlorine dioxide, but apparently ASPA operators are now regularly foregoing this stage in order to capture Europe's growing chlorine-free markets. ASPA's kraft output is used for traditional paper products such as office and magazine papers. ENCA's mill uses a slightly different hydrogen peroxide system to produce chlorine-free kraft "fluff," which is used to make diapers and coffee filters. A second Swedish mill has begun to convert to the Lignox system and others have reportedly tested it.

In a recent development, Finnish pulp and paper makers appear poised

to compete in the European market for chlorine-free paper products.

In Sweden, Austria, and the United Kingdom environmental groups have successfully used consumer pressure on retail products such as coffee filters and diapers as a lever to change industry practices. As a result, debate in the European pulp and paper industry has shifted away from whether a firm can afford to switch technology to whether it can afford not to.

*continued next page*

## ... Pulp and Paper

### North American Market

A few Canadian firms that sell to Europe—the biggest are Howe Sound Pulp and Paper, Fletcher Challenge, and MacMillan-Bloedel—are under pressure to eliminate chlorine. Oddly enough, most of these firms are located all the way across the country, in British Columbia, due to the kinds of trees found in western Canada.

But the vast majority of the pulp produced in the Great Lakes region is sold to the American market, which unfortunately has almost entirely neglected the issue of asking for chlorine-free products. The few consumer items marketed in North America on the basis of being chlorine-free (for example, the Loblaw's supermarket chain's "green" line of diapers, hygienic pads, coffee filters and other items) are in fact often free only of pure chlorine. They are bleached with chlorine dioxide.

Although public and corporate demands have not yet been strong enough to have a significant impact on the thinking of North America's pulp and paper makers, other forms of market pressure may soon help solve the problem. The majority of bleached kraft pulp has traditionally been sold to paper companies as a raw commodity; producing mills have had little idea whether the pulp would be used for photocopy or tissue paper. This has meant that the pulp had to be both of great strength and of great brightness, even though only a tiny percent of the products made from kraft pulp needs both qualities.

But paper markets are beginning to segment, and pulps are now more frequently being made to have specific properties. This market fragmentation may allow some producers out of the strength/brightness dilemma, permitting them to move away from chlorine for pulps where there is little disadvantage to doing so. With some jiggering of processes and management, this can include most pulps. The two Great Lakes mills that are investigating chlorine-free pulp production belong to integrated companies that make both pulp and paper, allowing easier coordination of the two kinds of manufacturing.

### Paper-Making

There are five basic stages in the production of paper products:

- Turning harvested wood into chips;
- Milling chips into pulp, either mechanically or chemically;
- Bleaching pulp to make it whiter;
- Converting pulp into various grades and shades of paper; and
- Making paper into a finished product.

The first three stages are carried out in pulp mills, the fourth in paper mills (sometimes the two kinds of mills are integrated into single operations), the fifth by printers and packagers. Each of these stages (and the hidden sixth step of disposal after use) has significant environmental costs, but it is bleaching that produces the greatest load of persistent toxic chemicals.

The mechanical pulping process involves steaming or grinding the

chips, producing pulp with short (and therefore weak) fibres that are not very white. Because they retain a large amount of a wood substance called lignin, a glue attached to wood's white cellulose fibres, mechanical pulp yellows with exposure to light. Mechanical pulping accounts for about 5 percent of world pulp production.

The chemical pulping process involves boiling (cooking in industry parlance) wood chips in either sodium sulphite or sodium sulphate. Both processes produce pulps with longer (and

thousand compounds, most of them foreign to nature. Only 300 of these chemicals have been studied; several hundred components of paper-making effluent therefore remain of unknown composition and effects. This is particularly disturbing because many of the compounds studied so far have turned out to be both persistent in the environment and toxic in extremely small quantities. Dioxin is only one of many paper-making by-products of this type. Most of the persistent toxic chemicals banned in

which changes the structure of the lignin, whitening it, but does not remove it.

Sulphite pulp mills were once as chlorine-dependent as kraft mills, but over the last four years virtually the whole industry has converted to chlorine-free bleaching, mostly of the hydrogen peroxide type. All non-chlorine bleaching technologies weaken the pulp somewhat, but since sulphite pulp is far brighter than kraft pulp to begin with, and because its end products are not as strength-dependent, sulphite pulping is much less sensitive to the technological problems of moving to chlorine-free production.

The products made from dissolving pulp require such purity, which can only be obtained by drastic bleaching, that one would think it a lost cause to attempt to produce it without chlorine. However, almost as if to prove that anything can be done if it is environmentally necessary, Norway's Borregard Industries has managed to develop a peroxide dissolving pulp that the Swedish Svenska firm uses to make rayon.

Kraft pulping is the heavy hitter in the pulping industry. Since kraft technology creates almost three-fourths of the world's pulp, redesign of kraft bleaching processes to omit the use of chlorine is the long

ball in pulp and paper zero-discharge efforts. The most important concern in designing non-chlorine kraft bleaching methods is to minimize the need for that bleaching. All non-chlorine chemicals reduce the strength of kraft pulp, which can only be weakened to a limited degree if it is to be used in operations like high-speed magazine printing, which requires tremendous strength.

Designers of non-chlorine kraft bleaching processes therefore focus their efforts in three areas:

- Cooking the pulp so that it requires less bleaching (for example, an advance called "extended cooking" has recently been improved on with a method called "modified continuous cooking");
- Using less bleach during the bleaching stages (principally by improving "extraction," the removal of free-floating lignin and other waste between stages); and
- Modifying methods of using non-chlorine chemicals (such as manipulating the pressure and concentration of the chemicals in the pulping mixture) so that they do less damage to the cellulose.

continued next page



Great Lakes effluent inflow at a Canadian pulp and paper mill, 1990

therefore stronger) fibres than mechanical pulps, and both do a good job of removing lignin.

Sulphite pulp, which makes up about 7 percent of the world market, is whiter than sulphate pulp when it enters the bleaching operation. Sulphate pulp, commonly called kraft pulp, from the German word for "strong," is, logically, much stronger. Kraft pulp's strength allows it to be used for almost any product. It can also be made from softwood trees, which other processes find more difficult to convert into strong pulp. For these and other reasons, kraft pulp is far and away the most popular pulp sold, accounting for 77 percent of the world market.

The drawback of kraft pulping is that sulphate cooking darkens it. The pulp can be used as is for brown paper bags and cardboard boxes, but for most uses it must be heavily bleached. Packaging, magazine and other printing paper, and even consumer products such as tissue paper and diapers are some of the products made from bleached kraft pulp. Ninety percent of kraft pulp is bleached.

A third form of chemical pulping, dissolving pulping, which accounts for about 7 percent of the world market, modifies sulphite and kraft pulping processes to produce an almost pure form of cellulose used to make such unlikely products as cellophane and rayon. However, this requires the most intense bleaching of all the pulping processes.

### Paper-Making Discharges

The total discharge of organochlorines into the Great Lakes from pulp and paper plants is estimated by Greenpeace researchers at about 350 million pounds per year as of late 1990. No official figures are available because only Canada has ever compiled statistics on pulp and paper discharges of organochlorines as a whole. In the United States paper makers need only report the discharge of the more notorious organochlorines, such as dioxin.

In the pulping process chlorine combines with unwanted organic material in pulp to form more than a

the last few years are organochlorines, including DDT, PCBs, chlordane, and toxaphene.

It should not be forgotten that many of the elements of paper-making effluent can be found in very small quantities in the paper product. When this paper is used to contain food, as milk cartons are, this fact becomes a serious concern for human health.

### Non-Chlorine Bleaching

Bleaching whitens pulp by removing or altering lignin and a few other substances found in wood. Lignin has two negative qualities for paper-makers: it is yellow, and it gets darker when exposed to light. Chlorine and its compounds attack only the lignin and other substances, leaving the cellulose fibres untouched. Unfortunately, all non-chlorine bleaching chemicals—generally oxygen, ozone, or hydrogen peroxide—attack the fibre as well as the lignin, weakening the pulp.

Non-chlorine pulp manufacturers thus must choose to use a lot of substitute chemicals, producing weaker, fully bright pulps, or less substitute chemicals, producing darker, full-strength pulps. Fortunately, the degree of trade-off will likely lessen as non-chlorine bleaching technology is advanced and technical managers develop better methods to control the bleaching process. There are also advanced ways of brightening paper through the use of fillers mixed with the pulp and coatings applied after it is made into paper. These technologies are currently in a state of rapid development. Coatings and fillers already make up a third by weight of some papers, like magazine stock, and this percentage is expected to grow substantially in coming years.

Mechanical pulp is weak, so it is especially suitable for making papers like newsprint that do not require great strength during the printing operation. Such papers usually do not need to be very white and are often used for only a short time, so it is possible to obtain satisfactory results with a bleaching agent far less powerful than chlorine, usually hydrogen peroxide,

**Bulletin of Pollution Prevention**  
 Reg Gilbert  
*editing, design, production*

**Pollution Prevention Project**  
 Tony Luppino  
*research writer*  
 Karen Murphy  
*field coordinator*  
 Valerie Galante  
*information manager*

**Great Lakes United**  
 Buffalo State College, Casetty Hall  
 1300 Elmwood Ave., Buffalo, N.Y. 14222 or  
 P.O. Box 548, Station A,  
 Windsor, Ontario N9A 6M6

The Pollution Prevention Project is funded by the Great Lakes Protection Fund and the Canadian Institute for Environmental Law and Policy. The Bulletin of Pollution Prevention is funded by the Great Lakes Protection Fund.

## ... Pulp and Paper

### Industry Response

Most Great Lakes mills are not moving toward eliminating the use of chlorine. They are simply responding to existing or anticipated regulation, which in both Canada and the United States is focused on limiting the emission of dioxins and furans. To meet these regulations, most Great Lakes mills are employing or planning to employ so-called "virtual elimination" technology. Its elements are:

- Replacing existing chlorine gas bleaching with chlorine dioxide bleaching. This reduces organochlorine discharges by half and drives levels of 2,3,7,8 dioxin and 2,3,7,8 furan under the limits of detection in effluent;
- Adding secondary treatment, which diverts between 20 and 50 percent of organochlorines to a combination of air, sludge, and conversion to inorganic salts. The sludge is usually dumped on land; and
- Adding an oxygen "pre-bleach." This is an essential step on the way to eliminating chlorine. However, it cannot replace chlorine independently. This step is being added in only a few mills.

Pulp and paper makers want regulation to be based only on levels of waterborne discharge, not on the original use of persistent, toxic chemicals or their precursors (chemicals that combine to become persistent and toxic during the production process or during or after discharge).

The industry claim is that chlorine is essential to the pulp-making process, and that in any case there is no need to stop using chlorine because its toxic byproducts can be limited to "acceptable" levels in effluent. To sugarcoat the idea of acceptable levels of persistent toxic substances, the industry commonly refers to it as "virtual elimination in effluent."

The European example shows that chlorine is unnecessary for bleaching any but the most specialized of papers, for which chlorine-free methods have yet to be developed.

The idea of acceptable levels of discharge can be dismissed almost as

easily. The concept is the underpinning of objections to discharge regulation by all industry, but it has no application in the context of pulp- and paper-making: bleaching effluent contains just too many compounds that are both harmful in quantities almost below measuring and likely to remain in the environment unaltered for decades.

Furthermore, it is only reasonable to think that there are many more such compounds among the two-thirds of organochlorines in bleaching effluent not yet studied. Applied to bleaching effluent, "acceptable levels of discharge" is just another way of saying "no news is good news."

Under the industry's idea of an effective regulatory system, the allowed level of most chemical discharges would be slightly below what has been proved toxic, for the most dangerous compounds, the allowed limits would be set below what has proved detectable. Chemicals not proved to be toxic would not be regulated.

Unfortunately, the record of toxicity studies is that their conclusions are often revised downward every few years, sometimes by orders of magnitude. As for compounds not yet studied, bleaching produces so many that it would be impractical to prove which of them are toxic in anything less than decades. Even that effort would be possible only if a government research program many, many times more active than today were put into effect. Knowledge about dioxin, which is only barely adequate, has cost about \$5 billion. We would bankrupt ourselves attempting such study of all the chemicals produced in pulp and paper making.

In any case, environmental history has generally been one of finding out that chemicals are substantially more dangerous than originally thought after they have already been permitted into the environment in large quantities. Lead is a good example of this process. Its level of generally recognized toxicity in the environment has been reduced to less than a thousandth of that considered problematic in the early 1970s.

To base regulation on proving which organochlorines are toxic and at what levels is really to argue against a comprehensive effort to protect human or wildlife health from these chemicals. Organochlorines are al-

ready well-known to be very dangerous.

### Zero Discharge

Zero discharge is the only comprehensive way to protect the ecosystem on which Great Lakes humanity is so dependent. This is why Annex 12 of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement declares that, "The philosophy adopted for control of inputs of persistent toxic substances shall be zero discharge." Annex 12 also declares that the intent of the programs outlined in the annex is to "virtually eliminate input of persistent toxic substances," a straightforward acknowledgment that leakage from 50 years of toxic landfilling and other non-point sources of pollution will never be completely brought under control.

Unfortunately, industry has seized on this phrase, "virtual elimination," as if it were the governing ideology of Agreement-based pollution regulation. The reason is clear. Being non-quantitative, "virtual elimination" allows industry to argue for convenient emission levels: "below detection" or "environmentally acceptable." This bypasses the undeniable bottom line: small releases build up to huge quantities in sediment and wildlife.

Since the introduction of the zero discharge philosophy at the 1978 renegotiation of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, environmentalists have greatly refined the concept. It now encompasses the activities needed to actually bring zero discharge into effect. These activities have two major components: pollution prevention and sunset permitting.

### Pollution Prevention

The traditional method of mediating

pollution problems is pollution control, which captures some toxic waste in filters and attempts to dispose of it safely, or at least more safely. This method is seriously flawed for two principal reasons. To capture wastes and dispose of them often ends up merely delaying contamination or transferring contaminants to another place. The tall smokestacks built to reduce power-plant air pollution in local communities were quite effective; unfortunately, neighboring regions paid the price of increased acid rain. In like manner, waste incineration of toxic sludge transforms a water discharge into a smaller air emission and an ash deposit in a landfill. That deposit will eventually leak into the surrounding water table or else require expensive containment. Pollution control does not stop contamination of the environment. It delays contamination by transferring pollutants from one medium to another.

In any case, because emissions are cut but not eliminated by the various filtering processes, contamination of the environment is merely slowed. With growth in population and per-capita consumption, reduced rates of contamination eventually end up generating the same or even increased actual levels of discharge.

Pollution control of pulp and paper discharges manifest all these faults. Official U.S. "best available technology" for pollution control of pulp- and paper-making discharges specifies the construction of aerated lagoons to drastically reduce non-persistent substances, and convert a small amount of persistent organochlorines into inorganic salts that are neutral in effect if not benign. But a substantial amount of organochlorines are merely deposited in lagoon sludge, which is

continued next page

## Tell Us What You Think!

- ☞ Is the Bulletin of Pollution Prevention useful to you? Please explain.
- ☞ What topics would you like discussed in future issues of the Bulletin?
- ☞ Do you like the Bulletin's current orientation toward fewer, but longer and more in-depth articles, or would you prefer more, shorter articles?
- ☞ What changes, if any, would you like to see made in the Bulletin?
- ☞ Would you like extra copies of the Bulletin to distribute? If so, how many?

We'd like your help to improve the Bulletin. Please take a moment to answer this survey on a separate sheet and send it to us at: Great Lakes United, Buffalo State College, Cassety Hall, 1300 Elmwood Avenue, Buffalo, NY, 14222. Thank you for the effort.



## The Third New York State Environment and Labor Conference

November 22 - 24, Albany, New York

Lois Gibbs  
Pete Seeger  
Fred Millar, Friends of the Earth  
Pamela Leisinger, UAW  
Richard Miller, Labor Institute  
James Valenti, United Steelworkers  
Ward Stone, New York DEC

co-sponsored by  
24 New York State  
Environment, Labor, and  
Community Organizations

to register, call  
**(518) 462-5527**

# Baby Steps to Zero Discharge in Lake Superior

by Karen Murphy

September's meeting of the International Joint Commission witnessed the release by the United States, Canada, Ontario, Minnesota, Michigan, and Wisconsin of the long-awaited "Bi-National Program to Restore and Protect the Lake Superior Basin."

The governments claim that the program responds to the IJC's 1989 call to establish Lake Superior as a zero-discharge demonstration area. By and large, however, the actions described in the program are a recitation of existing regulatory programs supplemented by new initiatives that propose protection for only limited areas of the lake.

Missing in the "Binational Program" is the measure that defines government seriousness about zero discharge of persistent toxic chemicals into Lake Superior: a freeze on all new and increased releases of chemicals into the lake.

In the United States this could be accomplished by designating the whole of Lake Superior as Outstanding National Resource Waters for persistent toxic pollutants under the U.S. Clean Water Act. On the Canadian side a similar designation could be made through the Canada-Ontario Agreement Respecting Great Lakes Water Quality, as well as under the Canada Water Act.

Of course, this is only the first step that is required. The governments should also have a plan to phase out the use and discharge of persistent toxic substances. This can be started immediately through existing regulatory programs such as the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System in the United States and through Control Orders in Canada.

## United States

In the "Binational Program" the

United States government pledges to designate specific areas of the Great Lakes Basin (mostly waters off the shores of national parks, recreational areas and wildlife refuges) as Outstanding National Resource Waters (ONRW). This would have the effect of instituting a freeze on the discharge of persistent toxic chemicals in those areas.

The government also plans to designate all the waters of Lake Superior as Outstanding International Resource Waters (OIRW). Under OIRW "the increased discharge of certain designated persistent bioaccumulative toxic substances will not be allowed without an adequate anti-degradation demonstration." Such a demonstration requires proof that proposed new or increased discharges would not further degrade the existing quality of area water.

Although they appear groundbreaking, the U.S. designations have crippling flaws. ONRW designation provides the highest level of protection for water under the Clean Water Act, but the areas to be protected by ONRW status under the program are mainly places where siting of industrial facilities is already prohibited or unlikely to occur. The designation provides an additional layer of protection for waters that are (relatively) pristine, but it does nothing to protect other areas of Lake Superior from existing and new sources of persistent toxic substances.

OIRW designation, slated for the whole of Lake Superior, offers less protection than ONRW status. OIRW designation currently has no meaning under law. The "protection" offered by such a designation hinges on an "anti-degradation demonstration." The tests and standards for anti-degradation are still being defined through the Great Lakes Water Quality Initiative process. The test being used for Lake Superior

combines "best available technology" requirements, which are as yet undefined, with socioeconomic considerations. In Wisconsin, for example, one additional job is sufficient demonstration of a socioeconomic need. The OIRW designation does not put a freeze on inputs of persistent toxic substances and it does not prohibit new facilities from discharging persistent toxic substances.

Furthermore, the program targets only nine chemicals—2,3,7,8 TCDD, octachlorostyrene, hexachlorobenzene, chlordane, DDT, DDE and its metabolites, toxaphene, PCBs, and mercury. Several of these chemicals are not even discharged into Lake Superior from point sources. By contrast, the Great Lakes Water Quality Initiative, a process being undertaken by the eight Great Lakes states and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to develop uniform water quality criteria, has already identified over 40 persistent, bioaccumulative toxics for immediate action. At a minimum, the program should target those chemicals currently identified in the Initiative process.

The program also fails to address phasing out existing sources of persistent toxic chemicals. The "Binational Program" indicates that industry will be required to develop reduction plans for each new or re-issued toxics discharge permit that has an effluent limit below detection (this is the case for dioxin, PCBs and mercury). However, the actual implementation of these reduction plans is not mandatory, nor is it enforceable.

## Canada

In the Canadian portion of the plan, the federal government and Ontario pledged to address the issue of special designation during the renegotiation of the Canada-Ontario Agree-

ment. However, no details were given on how special designation might fulfill the IJC's recommendation.

The federal and provincial governments are also developing water quality regulations for pulp and paper mill discharges. The "Binational Program" never clearly delineates how effluent controls will be defined. For example, will the emphasis in pulping be on eliminating the use of chlorine, or on simply reducing organochlorine concentrations in effluent?

The plan does state that the regulations of the Ontario Municipal and Industrial Strategy for Abatement "are being developed to virtually eliminate persistent toxic substances from industrial effluents." The use of the term "virtual elimination" in this manner is very disturbing. It indicates that the aim of the Province is to focus reduction efforts on discharges rather than on the original use of toxic chemicals. Focusing reduction efforts on the end of the pipe merely transfers pollution to different media. For example, increasing treatment of water discharges creates more toxicity in the sludge. The sludge is eventually landfilled or incinerated, transferring toxic contaminants from the original water discharge to land and air.

It is apparent that the giant steps citizens had hoped to achieve for Lake Superior are not forthcoming in the "Binational Program" of the Great Lakes governments. The federal governments have not identified specific actions to establish a freeze on new or increased discharges of persistent toxic substances into the Lake, nor have the governments identified mechanisms for phasing out existing sources of persistent toxic pollutants.

## ... Pulp and Paper

usually disposed of in a landfill, or even by incineration.

A further substantial amount of lagoon-treated pulp-and-paper organochlorines are simply evaporated (*volatilized*, in regulatory parlance). It is worth noting here that although pulp-making is the largest source of persistent toxic discharge to the Lakes, the largest source of persistent toxic input to the Lakes is from non-point sources, particularly (and amazingly) air deposition, a substantial portion of which (yet more amazingly) comes from Mexico. This has become clear because, for example, high levels of PCBs, no longer produced in the United States or Canada, continue to turn up in Great Lakes water samples and cannot be accounted for by sediment disturbances.

Lagoon technology reduces persistent toxic pulp and paper discharges by only 50 percent. The rest flows freely into the Great Lakes, where it will last for years, be stirred up from the bottom periodically in the wake of storms, accumulate in the tissues of wildlife and harm their ability to reproduce, and be consumed by people in fish and drinking water.

Pollution prevention is the attempt in regulation and industrial practice to bypass studies of temporary validity, technologies of limited effect, and half-measures with unfortunate trade-offs. A few of the most important pollution prevention techniques developed in the last few years are:

- Chemical substitution, which replaces persistent toxic chemicals in production processes with chemicals that are non-persistent

and non-toxic;

- Process change, which alters production processes to eliminate the need for persistent toxic chemicals; and
- Product reformulation, which redesigns products to eliminate the need for persistent toxic chemicals.

Zero-discharge-oriented pulping uses all these techniques. Oxygen, ozone and hydrogen peroxide (and, perhaps someday, substances such as nitrogen oxide and sodium hydro-sulphite) are used as substitutes for chlorine. Cooking and extraction modifications and advances in the use of fillers and coatings make the use of those substitute chemicals practical. And market segmentation and mill integration allow a form of product reformulation, in which pulp strength and brightness can be tailored to the needs of the paper it will be made into.

It is important to note that pollution prevention changes can result in cost savings that repay pollution prevention investment within a couple of years, sometimes more quickly. Expensive chemicals can be recycled, or eliminated in favour of cheaper chemicals, and the costs of waste disposal can be reduced or eliminated entirely.

Goods produced without the use of toxic chemicals can often be marketed at a premium on that basis. This is particularly true in the paper industry. Even as pulp prices are falling worldwide, chlorine-free pulps are commanding a premium of between \$50 and \$80 per tonne.

## Sunset Permitting

The second major vehicle for imple-

menting zero discharge policies is sunset permitting. Cost savings, "environmentally safe" marketing, and reduced government oversight are the carrots of pollution prevention. Sunset permitting is the stick.

Traditional pollution control regulators set a legal limit to the amount of a given chemical that can be released in a given place. The impossible job of these regulators is to decide permissible levels of pollution, levels that supposedly will not harm human health. These decisions are inevitably arbitrary.

Sunset permitting simplifies regulators' jobs. They set times by which discharge and/or use of given chemicals must cease, with intermediate deadlines for declining permissible levels of discharge. To do this regulators need only look at the technical and economic feasibility of implementing zero-discharge processes.

The next step to cleaning up and protecting the Great Lakes is to apply zero discharge ideas to a major industry. In doing so, Great Lakes environmentalists and regulators will perfect government programs, regulations and enforcement oriented toward zero discharge, learn how to help along market changes that facilitate zero discharge, and develop means to assure that communities and workers do not bear the brunt of dislocations caused by that transition.

Pulp and paper is the industry of choice for this first step. It is technically ready to implement needed changes, and will not suffer economically in the process.

## What Can Be Done Now

The role of environmentalists in the great conversion of pulp and paper

will be threefold:

- To hold the line on the definitional issues surrounding zero discharge—it is far different from "virtual elimination";
- To hold the feet of government to the fire in implementing zero discharge programs instead of pollution control programs; and
- To educate American consumers about the urgent need to use chlorine-free paper.

Greenpeace and its friends will soon be holding an international meeting to decide the elements of a concerted campaign to begin putting serious pressure on pulp and paper makers to start making chlorine-free products.

In the meantime, grassroots Great Lakes activists can help reduce persistent toxic pulp-and-paper discharges to the Great Lakes in two major ways:

- Urging programs on government at the local, city, county and state levels to reduce the use of paper and to recycle it; and
- Inserting into procurement policies issued by such bodies clauses that privilege chlorine-free paper as they now often privilege recycled paper.

Using less paper means making and bleaching less pulp (and, of course, destroying fewer trees). And obtaining chlorine-free procurement policies means laying the strongest basis for chlorine-free pulp and paper production: marketplace demand.

# **POLICY RESOLUTIONS**



**GREAT LAKES UNITED**

**RESOLUTION ON  
BANNING CHLORINE IN THE PAPER INDUSTRY**

WHEREAS, the International Joint Commission on the Great Lakes in its Fifth Biennial Report recommended to the parties that Lake Superior be used as a test case "where no point source of any persistent toxic substance will be permitted"; AND

WHEREAS, by far the largest toxic point source discharger into Lake Superior is the paper industry which puts massive quantities of organochlorine poisons into Lake Superior; AND

WHEREAS, this mass of toxic pollution can be reduced to zero without job loss by banning the use of chlorine and chlorine compounds for de-lignification and bleaching by the pulp industry; AND


WHEREAS, zero discharge of these poisons can be achieved in no other way;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that Great Lakes United calls upon all U.S. and Canadian Jurisdictions on Lake Superior to ban the use of chlorine and chlorine compounds used for de-lignification and bleaching by the paper industry on Lake Superior; AND

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Great Lakes United views this as a litmus test issue in determining whether or not political leaders and regulators are willing to comply with the visionary spirit of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement; AND

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that Great Lakes United supports a ban on the use of chlorine and chlorine compounds for de-lignification and bleaching by the paper industry throughout the Great Lakes/ St. Lawrence River Basin, throughout North America and throughout the world.

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS IS A TRUE COPY OF A RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF GREAT LAKES UNITED ON MAY 6, 1990.



Dorreen Carey, Secretary



RESOLUTION ON LAKE SUPERIOR

WHEREAS, Lake Superior is the largest freshwater lake in the world and while it is a relatively pristine lake, it still has some serious contamination problems as evidenced by the seven Areas of Concern located along its shores; AND

WHEREAS, as part of their Fifth Biennial Report, the International Joint Commission recommended that Lake Superior be designated as a demonstration zone for zero discharge of persistent toxic substances; AND

WHEREAS, since that recommendation, the governments have taken no concrete action to implement the recommendation; AND

WHEREAS, Lake Superior represents the ultimate pollution prevention challenge in that it is an opportunity to put protective measures in place while it is still relatively unpolluted; AND

WHEREAS, the pulp and paper industry represents the largest source of point pollution to Lake Superior emitting thousands of tons of organochlorine compounds into the Lake each year.


THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that Great Lakes United calls upon the governments of the United States, Canada, Ontario, Wisconsin, Michigan, and Minnesota to immediately implement a moratorium for new or increased discharges of persistent toxic pollutants to Lake Superior until the International Joint Commission recommendation has been implemented; AND

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the governments use their statutory authority to designate Lake Superior as an Outstanding National Resource Water (ONRW) for persistent toxic pollutants, the highest protective status given to water bodies under the U.S. Clean Water Act, and that the Lake be given a similar protective status under Canadian law; AND

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the governments immediately schedule a phase out of the use of chlorine in the pulp and paper industry to eliminate the major point source of persistent toxic pollutants to Lake Superior; AND

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the governments take other appropriate action to implement the International Joint Commission recommendation for Lake Superior as a demonstration area.

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS IS A TRUE COPY OF A RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF GREAT LAKES UNITED ON MAY 5, 1991.



Dorreen Carey, Secretary

## ZERO DISCHARGE & POLLUTION PREVENTION RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Great Lakes are still under great stress from toxic contamination; AND

WHEREAS, the federal governments have committed to the goal of zero discharge and virtual elimination of persistent toxic substances under the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement; AND

WHEREAS, the term "Zero Discharge" is defined in the following way: "Zero Discharge" means ending the use, the production, and thus the disposal of persistent and/or bioaccumulative toxics. Zero discharge means no further human discharges of a substance into the environment. "Zero" means zero. Pollution must be prevented before it is generated. Production processes must be changed so that persistent toxics substances are not used, produced or discharged. "Zero" does not mean reducing discharges beneath some arbitrary level or even beneath the level of detection. Zero means none. The use of the term "discharge" is not limited to a single environmental medium. It applies to toxic discharges into water, air, landfill, product, the workplace, etc. Nor can persistent toxics be eliminated by shifting them from one medium to another or by attempting to recycle them after they have been produced; AND

WHEREAS, the term "Virtual Elimination" is defined as the near-complete elimination of the presence of toxic pollutants from the ecosystem, recognizing that it is impossible to totally eliminate toxic substances from the Great Lakes ecosystem because we cannot completely clean-up or recapture all of those contaminants already released; AND

WHEREAS, the US EPA recently released a woefully inadequate "pollution prevention strategy" and pollution prevention efforts undertaken to date by the government of Canada are seriously lacking in content; AND

WHEREAS, in June of 1989 the US EPA launched its "Great Lakes Water Quality Initiative", a cooperative effort with the Great Lakes states to develop consistent regulatory programs among the states for complying with the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement in protecting and restoring Great Lakes water quality; AND

WHEREAS, there is the need for a comprehensive and coherent strategy to achieve the goals of zero discharge and virtual elimination of persistent toxic substances.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that our strategy for achieving the objectives of zero discharge and virtual elimination is two-pronged:

- 1) Stop all future discharges of the most harmful pollutants through a zero discharge program and substantially reduce the discharge of all other chemicals;
- 2) Clean up those contaminants that have been released into the Great Lakes; AND

More specifically, our recommendations for reforming existing programs and for adopting new polices and programs are as follows:

Immediately Freeze Toxic Dumping.

No government in the Great Lake Basin should issue or reissue a discharge permit that would allow any increase in the amount released of any of the 362 chemicals on the Water Quality Board's "1986 Working List of Chemicals in the Great Lakes Basin".

Sunset the Most Dangerous Toxic Chemicals.

Persistent bioaccumulative toxic chemicals should immediately be banned from further use or manufacture anywhere in the Great Lakes Basin, even if there is little evidence of specific toxic effects.

The U.S. and Canadian Federal Governments should set up a joint sunset task force. The public should be consulted in all aspects of this task force's work. The task force should submit its recommendations to the U.S. and Canadian Governments by the September, 1993, biennial meeting of the IJC.

The task force should:

- adopt criteria for placing a chemical on the sunset list;
- determine methods to measure chemicals using these criteria;
- list the chemicals to be sunset; AND

The U.S. and Canadian Federal Governments should use the criteria for banning chemicals developed by the sunset task force to screen the use or production of new chemicals in the Great Lakes Basin.

The two Federal Governments should set specific timetables for phasing out all chemicals not subject to an immediate ban. These timetables should be set by September of 1994, one year after the task force's recommendations are issued.

The Canadian and U.S. Governments should issue a sunset reference to the International Joint Commission. This reference should be announced by the September, 1991, meeting of the IJC.

#### Reduce Use of Toxics.

Each Government in the Great Lakes Basin should implement comprehensive toxics use reduction programs that include:

1. Clearly specified toxics use reduction goals and objectives;
2. The gathering of inventories and audits of toxics use;
3. Toxics use reduction planning by each industrial sector and each industrial facility using toxics, as well as by non-industrial sectors, institutions, and organizations using toxics in our society;
4. Technical assistance programs, including training designed to teach facility management to incorporate the costs of using toxics and controlling pollution into the facility's cost accounting procedures;
5. Community and worker right-to-act provisions, including training for community residents and workers on use and effects of toxics, and on identifying toxics use reduction opportunities and methods for specific facilities;
6. Incorporation of worker compensation and economic protection, as well as other options, in toxics use reduction planning;
7. Reorganization of government agencies on a multi-media basis;
8. Toxic use reduction standards;
9. Toxics use reduction permitting procedures; AND

Each Government in the Great Lake Basin should set a goal of 50% reduction in the total use of toxic chemicals by 1996 and 75% reduction by 2000.

Governments in the Great Lakes Basin should require that each industry, each industrial facility, and each sector of users of toxic chemicals develop toxics use reduction plans by 1994 that will achieve the overall goals of 50% reduction in use of toxics by 1996 and 75% reduction by 2000.

Each Government in the Great Lakes Basin should pass legislation encouraging good neighbour agreements and giving all community residents and workers the following rights:

1. The right to information and inspection;
2. Worker right to refuse unsafe work;
3. Worker right to report pollution;
4. The right to sue;
5. That worker compensation and protection as well as other options be included in Pollution Prevention; AND

Adopt Zero Discharge Technologies as the Best Available Technology.

Governments should immediately revise their technology-based effluent standards to ensure that they are based on the best available toxics use reduction methods. Government environmental programs should officially view toxics use reduction methods as the Best Available Technology

Generic toxics use reduction/zero discharge methods or technologies include:

- substituting non-toxic or less toxic alternatives for the targeted toxic substances currently used in production processes;
- reformulating products so that the targeted toxic substances are no longer needed as raw materials or ingredients;
- improving housekeeping practices at industrial facilities so that less of the targeted toxic substances are wasted and less need to be used in production;

- reducing the amount of cooling water used and discharged in production processes by conserving and recycling water;
- changing technologies and methods of production to eliminate the need for, or to reduce the use of, targeted toxic substances;
- replace old inefficient equipment with newer equipment that uses targeted toxics more efficiently thereby reducing the overall use of the substances;
- improve equipment maintenance to increase efficiency and reduce the use of targeted toxics; AND

#### Protect Lake Superior.

The U.S. and Canada should immediately implement a zero discharge strategy for Lake Superior. The strategy should include:

1. Designation of Lake Superior as "outstanding national resource water";
2. A freeze on building new or expanding existing pulp and paper mills that use chlorine and chlorine compounds;
3. A phase-out of the use of chlorine and chlorine compounds, and the discharge of all persistent toxic chemicals at existing pulp and paper mills;
4. An independent environmental review in Canada of the impacts of logging and forest management practices on Lake Superior;
5. An inventory of undeveloped Lake Superior shoreline, and preparation by the U.S. and Canada of a joint plan for protecting sensitive and undeveloped areas; AND

#### Reform Water Quality Standards.

Effective water quality standards must be adopted to provide benchmarks or measures of success to guide us down the path towards virtual elimination of persistent toxic substances from the Great Lakes ecosystem. Legislation and regulations should state that Water Quality Standards are only interim and that the standard for all persistent toxic substances will be changed to "virtually eliminated."

By June 30, 1994, all Governments in the Great Lakes Basin should adopt uniform Water Quality Standard based on fish being safe to eat by all wildlife and humans.

By June 30, 1994, Governments in the Great Lakes Basin should adopt new Water Quality Standard to protect babies from developmental problems.

By June 30, 1994, Great Lakes Governments should revise their Water Quality Standard for PCBs so that it is no higher than one part per quadrillion.

By June 30, 1994, uniform Water Quality Standards that protect wildlife should be adopted by all Great Lakes Governments. These standards should take into account bioaccumulation factors, the limitations of field data, protection of the most sensitive species and the combined effects of contaminants in the Great Lakes.

By June 30, 1994, Governments in the Great Lakes Basin should adopt new Water Quality Standards for dioxin (2,3,7,8 TCDD) of no higher than 0.0067 parts per quadrillion to protect wildlife.

By June 30, 1994, uniform Water Quality Standards should be adopted by all Great Lakes Governments that prevent an increased risk of cancer in humans by using an additive process to take into account the mixtures of cancer-causing chemicals in fish.

By June 30, 1994, all Great Lakes Governments should eliminate dilution provisions in existing regulatory programs.

By June 30, 1994, all Great Lakes Governments should adopt uniform anti-degradation policies that emphasize a zero discharge approach.

#### Develop and Enforce Lakewide Clean-up Strategies.

Comprehensive clean-up plans should be developed for each of the Great Lakes by January 1993. These clean-up plans should be based on the following six-step strategy:

- 1) Determine the total amounts of each toxic chemical currently entering the Lake from all sources on an annual basis;
- 2) Determine the reduction in total annual load for each chemical necessary to reduce concentrations enough to achieve Water Quality Standards;


- 3) Identify the current sources and pathways of each of the problem chemicals and the loading rates from each pathway;
- 4) Establish a timetable for reducing total loadings and set interim milestones;
- 5) Allocate a portion of the required reduction in total loadings back to each of the jurisdictions surrounding the Lake;
- 6) Enforce the load reduction targets, monitor progress and make adjustments, as necessary, as more information on sources becomes available;

By January 1, 1993, U.S. EPA, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan and Wisconsin should adopt a strategy for cleaning up PCB pollution in Lake Michigan. The first actions required in the strategy should be to clean up contaminated sediments in Waukegan Harbor and the Fox, Kalamazoo and Grand Cal Rivers, and elimination of at least half of the atmospheric sources of PCB pollution by the Year 2000. Allocation to the four States of the responsibility for meeting load reduction targets should be based primarily on current tributary loadings.

The Governments in the Great Lakes Basin should immediately intensify efforts to monitor likely sources and loading of PCBs and other persistent toxic chemicals.

By January 1, 1993, U.S. EPA and Environment Canada should enforce load reduction targets and timetables for lakewide clean-up strategies by using the tools available under the U.S. Clean Water Act and The Canadian Ontario Agreement Respecting Great Lakes Water Quality.

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS A TRUE COPY OF A RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF GREAT LAKES UNITED ON MAY 5, 1991.



---

Dorreen Carey, Secretary



RESOLUTION FROM GREAT LAKES UNITED TASKFORCE  
ON LABOR AND THE ENVIRONMENT

WHEREAS, the labor movement in the U.S. and Canada has supported Great Lakes United and other environmental programs for the protection and restoration of the Great Lakes ecosystem; AND

WHEREAS, the issue of environmental protection and quality jobs in the Great Lakes Basin is imperative; AND

WHEREAS, toxic reduction and zero discharge could impact on the stability and quality of present and future jobs; AND


WHEREAS, the ability to achieve zero discharge through pollution prevention, toxics use reduction, and other changes in production processes and production choices will be integrally related to the mutual cooperation and efforts of the labor movement in the affected industries.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that GREAT LAKES UNITED place a high and immediate priority on obtaining new funding to support the work of the Labor/Environment Task Force, with the objective of supporting paid staff time and providing other necessary resources; AND

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that GREAT LAKES UNITED will introduce and promote the principle of worker compensation and economic protection as well as other options in all its pollution prevention policies and initiatives; AND

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the GREAT LAKES UNITED'S Taskforce on Labour and the Environment will take responsibility for reviewing and evaluating current worker protection and compensation programs as they exist in the Great Lakes Basin with the future task of providing further policy recommendations to the Board as required.

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS IS A TRUE COPY OF A RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF GREAT LAKES UNITED ON MAY 5, 1991.



Dorreen Carey, Secretary

## CLEAN WATER ACT AND INCOME PROTECTION

WHEREAS, the labor movement in the U.S. and Canada has supported Great Lakes United and other environmental programmes for the protection and restoration of the Great Lakes ecosystem; AND

WHEREAS, the issue of environmental protection and quality jobs in the Great Lakes Basin is imperative; AND

WHEREAS, Great Lakes United has supported Toxic Use Reduction and Zero Discharge programs to protect and restore the Great Lakes Basin ecosystem; AND

WHEREAS, toxic reduction and zero discharge will impact on the stability and the quality of present and future jobs; AND

WHEREAS, Great Lakes United has resolved to introduce and promote the principle of worker compensation and economic protection as well as other options in all its pollution prevention policies and initiatives; AND


WHEREAS, the reauthorization of the U.S. Clean Water Act will be considered this year, 1992-1993.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that Great Lakes United will work closely with affiliated labor organizations, the bi-national labor movement at large, and other environmental organizations in the U.S. and Canada, through the GLU Labor/Environment Task Force, to assure that the goals and interests of affected workers as well as those of the bi-national environmental community are considered to the maximum extent possible; AND

THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Great Lakes United will campaign for, educate on, fully support, and if necessary, initiate, the inclusion of income protection language in the Clean Water Act; AND

THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the GLU Labour/Environment Task Force will seek to work with the labour movement in Canada on an ongoing basis to explore and investigate legislative mechanisms for the inclusion of income protection language in Canadian clean water legislation, as well, such as MISA and others which may arise in the future.

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS IS A TRUE COPY OF A RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE TENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF GREAT LAKES UNITED ON MAY 3, 1992.

  
Dorreen Carey, Secretary