

Nuclear Waste Management in Canada

Note to the Reader:

If you are opening this to look for something in particular, Ctrl+F (or Cmd+F if you're on a Mac) will allow you to search.

Acronym list

AECL - Atomic Energy of Canada Limited
CELA - Canadians Environmental Law Association
CANDU reactor - Canadian Deuterium Uranium reactor
CNL - Canadian Nuclear Laboratories
CNSC - Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission
DGR - Deep Geological Repository
IAEA - International Atomic Energy Agency
NLLP - National Legal Liabilities Program
NRCan - Natural Resources Canada
NSDF - Near Surface Disposal Facility
NWMO - Nuclear Waste Management Organization
NWW - Nuclear Waste Watch
OPG - Ontario Power Generation
SMR/SMNR - Small Modular Nuclear Reactor

Context

THE INTRACTABLE PROBLEM

The production of electricity from nuclear energy has created a radioactive waste problem in Canada. Massive amounts of relatively low level radioactive waste are created when uranium ore is mined. At each stage of processing that ore into fuel, more radioactive waste is created. At the end of the nuclear fuel generation cycle, highly radioactive spent fuel bundles remain.- 5.5 million of these are currently stored at nuclear power plants in New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario.

Radioactive waste persists on a very long geological time scale. In particular, high level waste such as the spent fuel rods, remains extremely dangerous for tens of thousands of years, far longer than the entirety of human history to date. Low and medium levels of waste can also be very hazardous for extended time periods, especially when they are mixed together.

Radioactive waste requires perpetual care and monitoring. It cannot be safely stored, sealed and abandoned. Due to the limitations in current engineering and scientific knowledge, there must be a means to monitor it for millenia and if necessary, retrieve and repack it.

A little known fact that might strike terror in the heart of every taxpayer is [that governments are the “owners”](#) of the vast majority of nuclear waste in Canada.

The problem of how to safely deal with our massive stockpiles of radioactive waste has always been left to future generations because there has never been anything close to an acceptable solution. This is generally true of all countries with nuclear reactors.

While the federal government is finally engaged in drafting a [Radioactive Waste Management policy](#), two important proposals have been moving forward regarding the disposal of most of Canada’s radioactive waste. The first is proposed by the Nuclear Waste Management Organization (NWMO) and would see high-level waste (mostly the spent fuel bundles) buried underground in a “Deep Geological Repository” or DGR, either in Teeswater, Ontario (25 kms east of Lake Huron) or in the far north-west of Ontario near the town of Ignace. The second proposal is from the consortium CNL to create an enormous mound of medium and lower level waste near Chalk River, Ontario. Neither proposal is waiting for the emergence of the new federal policy, which might set more stringent conditions than industry is proposing.

Additionally, there are new nuclear power facilities being proposed. The governments of Alberta, Ontario and New Brunswick are falling over themselves to support these so-called Small Modular Reactors, which are still in the research stage, completely untested and not particularly small.

Figure 1: Interim Storage Facilities and Potential Repository Locations



THE CRITICAL MOMENT

The federal government expects to circulate a draft of its Radioactive Waste Management Policy early in 2022. To illustrate how far Canada is from addressing the issues, one needs to simply look at the current 350 word [high-level policy “framework.”](#) This “framework” is Canada’s only policy statement on managing nuclear waste to date and is now 25 years old. It claims to ensure that the federal government regulates appropriately, but it does not identify any hands-on responsibility for ensuring safe waste management. Instead, the buck is passed to “waste producers and owners... for the funding, organization, management and operation of disposal and other facilities required for their wastes.”

In other words, under the existing half-page framework statement, industry has been able to decide for itself how best to dispose of its waste based on its own priorities. That is why international regulatory bodies as well as many many other organizations have pressured Canada for a valid comprehensive policy. And that is what we hope this entire review process and the forthcoming draft could do. In early 2022, we will have one last opportunity to give input on the future policy.

AN ORGANIZING OPPORTUNITY

Following the Annual Members Meeting, the Council of Canadians Board of Directors responded to a call from chapter activists and committed to engaging in the federal government's updating of Canada’s radioactive waste policy. Council staff and chapter volunteers will keep everyone up to date on the progress with release and consultation on the draft policy. Nuclear waste is not among key issues that the Council of Canadians has historically worked on, but it is a point of intersection between many of our core campaigns: water protection, climate justice, corporate capture, Indigenous rights, and democracy.

This resource document was created to help all of us navigate through these very complex issues surrounding radioactive nuclear industry waste management. It contains links to excellent sources for more information.

It is hoped that many of you who are taking the time to read through this resource archive, will share it within your networks. It is designed to answer many questions, in order to encourage Council members, supporters and local allies to use this once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to become informed and take part in the consultation on the forthcoming draft federal policy.

Together we can try to ensure that this terrible toxic legacy is not a dreadful burden on 7000 generations to come. We hope that all parts of our organization will take up this important battle.

WHAT SHOULD THE FEDERAL POLICY INCLUDE?

The Council is part of the [Nuclear Waste Watch](#) (NWW) network. NWW has been the leading nuclear watchdog in Canada for many decades, and we acknowledge their considerable expertise as we navigate this issue. According to NWW, the new policy must satisfy these requirements:

1. Canada needs an independent agency, arms-length from government and industry, to oversee radioactive waste management and decommissioning;
2. Radioactive waste requires perpetual care and monitoring and should NOT be abandoned;
3. Government and industry must be open and transparent in the management of radioactive waste and its transportation;
4. Indigenous peoples and other Canadians have a right to access information, to engage in decision-making, and to know the risks;
5. There should be no importing of radioactive waste from other countries and no plutonium extraction or reprocessing of radioactive fuel waste.

NUCLEAR WASTE - A RESOURCE ARCHIVE

Below is a list of key themes around the nuclear waste issue, as well as resources to help you learn more about how it will impact you and your community.

1. Radioactive waste persists on a long geological time scale, and carries serious health and environmental impacts

Radioactive materials are routinely produced in large quantities at every stage of nuclear power production, from uranium mining and enrichment to reactor operation and the reprocessing of spent fuel. Some nuclear waste remains toxic for over 100,000 years, and even minimal exposure still causes serious health damage or death.

a. Introductory resources on nuclear waste management in Canada

- [100,000 Years and Counting: A "Graphic Report"](#) by Tremblay and Castanie
- Video: [Nuclear Revival: Nuclear Wastes in Canada](#) by Dr. Gordon Edwards, a founding member of NWW and President of the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility
- Sierra Club US report: [Guidance on Implementing Sierra Club Policy on the Management of High-Level Nuclear Waste](#)

b. Human and Animal Health impacts of nuclear waste

- Low-level radiation connected to childhood cancer, see: [Radiation Risks and Cancer in Children Radiation and Cancer in Children](#)
- [Uranium and nuclear energy in New Brunswick and beyond](#) - the dangers and impact on human health

c. Agricultural impacts of nuclear waste

- "Our family's life is agriculture and it frustrates me to see the NWMO state that they will not affect agriculture and that the nuclear industry has never damaged local farms." - Eugene Bourgeois, sheep farmer from the documentary [Toxic Neighbour](#).

d. Canadian taxpayers own most of the nuclear waste, and cleaning up is costly

- Regarding the legacy industry waste at Chalk River, “In 2013, AECL completed a review of its long-term decommissioning strategy and updated its cost estimate to complete the NLLP (National Legal Liabilities Program) is about **\$10 billion** [2013 Canadian dollars].” For more on this, see [this 2017 document](#) from Concerned Citizens of Renfrew County Association.
- A different way of accounting for the liability from nuclear waste, [AECL's nuclear facility decommissioning liability is reported to be \\$7.1 billion.](#)
- [Cleaning up the Port Hope Area costs Canadians \\$1.28 billion, the largest environmental cleanup efforts in Canadian history.](#)

2. Radioactive waste requires perpetual care and monitoring and should NOT be abandoned.

Nuclear waste remains harmful for unimaginably long periods of time. Until the waste can be eliminated, it must be managed on a multigenerational basis. This implies continual monitoring and periodic retrieval and repackaging, or as Dr. Gordon Edwards refers to it, “[rolling stewardship](#)”.

“Canada must adopt a principle of “no abandonment” of nuclear waste, and instead ensure that it is properly stored, overseen, stewarded, including periodic re-packaging or housing as required for safety, with knowledge transferred to future generations and adequate resources provided for its oversight and management over an indefinite and on-going time horizon.” - [CELA Submission to National Radioactive Waste Policy Consultation 2021](#)

Current proposals for managing radioactive waste include endless “temporary storage,” leaving it in place, burying it in a “Near Surface Disposal Facility” (NSDF), or abandoning it in a Deep Geological Repository (DGR).”

a. Leaving it in place – somehow called “environmental stewardship”

- [Nuclear Power Demonstration Closure Project](#) was decommissioned, and the waste remains in place in Rolphton, Ontario.

b. Endless temporary storage:

- “For the past 30 years, our high-level waste has been stored above ground, next to the reactors that produce it. Disturbingly, the nuclear industry has yet to settle on how, when or where a permanent storage facility for high-level waste will be built.” - [Ontario's ever growing heap of high-level nuclear waste — Lake Ontario Waterkeeper](#)
- 400,000 radioactive fuel bundles are stored in open water pools at the Pickering Nuclear Station - [Pickering's big — and growing — waste problem](#)

c. Near Surface Disposal Facility

A million-cubic meter of “low-to-intermediate” radioactive waste is proposed for Chalk River to accommodate waste from local industry and many others across the country.

- [Chalk River Nuclear Waste MegaDump: Five Fatal Flaws](#)
- The proposed NSDF in Chalk River would allow waste to deliberately and routinely come into contact with the environment. [Flagrant disregard of IAEA safety standards in the proposed NSDF](#)
- [Consortium’s study appears to show the Chalk River mound would disintegrate](#)
- First Nations are opposed to the NSDF site [Joint Declaration between the Anishinabek Nation and the Iroquois Caucus on the transport and abandonment of radioactive waste](#)
- Many citizens’ groups, along with NGOs, First Nations, and more than 140 downstream municipalities are opposed to the plan - [Citizens’ groups say licensing hearings for the giant Chalk River nuclear waste dump beside the Ottawa River should be stopped](#)
- Council of Canadians Ottawa chapter’s presentation to Ottawa City Council re: Chalk River proposal:
 -  [Eva S Water and the Chalk River mound_Mar30_ESchacherl.pptx](#)
 -  [Helen Mason Ottawa Presentation \(HM Mar 26-21\).pptx](#)
 -  [Helen Mason's Five-minute Talk to Environment Committee \(rev Ma...](#)
 -  [Ole's City of Ottawa presentation.pdf](#)
- “How do you feel about 1 000 000 m3 of radioactive waste being abandoned in an “engineered landfill” beside your Ottawa River?”
[Ottawa Riverkeeper studies plans for permanent disposal of radioactive waste beside the Ottawa River](#)

d. Deep Geologic Repository (DGR)

DGR is the industry’s proposed solution for long-term, permanent storage of the highest-level radioactive waste.

In 2002 the federal government gave the nuclear industry permission to organize themselves as the “non-profit” *Nuclear Waste Management Organization* and so relaunch their search for a suitable site and a willing community to host a Deep Geological Repository. Two areas remain under investigation: the Revell Lake area, 35 kilometres west of Ignace, in northwestern Ontario, and an area just north of Teeswater in the Municipality of South Bruce in southwestern Ontario. In the process of identifying a willing host, the NWMO has engaged in a number of questionable tactics to manufacture consent (see also 5)

- “The Nuclear Waste Management Organization is proposing to conduct an experiment within the community of South Bruce. Nowhere in the world is there a deep geological repository for irradiated nuclear fuel. Incredibly, the South Bruce site is the only one proposed as a high-level radioactive waste dump in the world without a buffer from communities, schools and businesses”: [Protect Our](#)

[Waterways-No Nuclear Waste](#); see also: Report on our interactions and issues with the NWMO team

- “The whole thing will fail. It might take a thousand years, but it will fail. Because no matter what kind of a container, no matter how solid that container you put into the ground, sooner or later it will rot and it will break. And whatever is in it will spread.” [We the Nuclear Free North – Join us to oppose nuclear waste burial in Northwestern Ontario](#)
- [Walk against nuclear waste to challenge NWMO](#): For more than decade NWMO continues probing communities in western Canada (mainly northern Saskatchewan) to encourage them to accept permanent nuclear waste storage. Federal agencies such as AECL and NWMO, along with industrial partners, offer grants, employment, building of amenities like arenas, rinks, meeting halls, and so forth, to any town agreeing to even consider a contract.

3. Transportation of nuclear waste is very risky

[The NWMO proposal](#) for disposing of the 5.5 million highly radioactive spent fuel bundles would see them transported by truck in 30,000 individual shipments- or roughly two truckloads per day, every day, for 40 years, mostly through densely populated areas.

Previous NWMO proposals have included the possibility of using ships to transport the waste through the Great Lakes. This would greatly reduce the number of shipments and the cost, but greatly increases the potential impact of any accidents. [Eight years ago, a plan to ship radioactive waste across the Great Lakes was officially cancelled after years of community opposition](#). Many saw this dubious “recycling plan” as an attempt to set a precedent and establish a history of shipping radioactive waste through the Great Lakes. The NWMO may still attempt to transport the waste by ship, especially if there is strong public opposition to road transport (which is inevitable).

- “The lack of regulations and standards specific to transport of radioactive waste creates unacceptable risks to conveyors, first responders, and the general public.” [Transport of radioactive waste - Submission to Radioactive Waste Policy Review](#)
- Accidents are common!- [Nuclear waste transportation accidents in Canada](#)
- “Transporting an unlimited amount of nuclear substances from OPG's facilities will place countless Ontarians at risk. A small accident involving radioactive material could have catastrophic consequences.”- [Sierra Club Foundation of Canada: Say NO to radioactive nuclear waste trafficking in Canada and U.S](#)
- [Concerns about imports of radioactive waste to Chalk River ~ Johanna Echlin](#)
- [Highly Radioactive Liquid Transports from Chalk River \[video, Feb 2017\]](#)
- Video: [The Problem with Transporting Radioactive Waste - Nuclear Energy Information Service](#)

4. The nuclear industry lacks oversight and accountability

There is vast “corporate capture” of government and other regulatory bodies nominally responsible for ensuring safe management of nuclear waste that is made worse by privatization, deregulation and the continual abrogation of responsibility by all parties.

a. The revolving door between regulators and the nuclear industry

- Natural Resource Canada (NRCan) is responsible for both promoting nuclear power generation and other uranium-based nuclear industries AND ensuring that nuclear waste is properly managed. Currently, there is no federal policy for this management other than a high-level framework from 1996, which means the federal government continues to leave almost everything up to the best judgment of the industry.



- CEO of the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC), the regulator of the nuclear industry, previously worked for Ontario Power Generation, Canada’s largest owner of nuclear power plants.
- The Nuclear Waste Management Organization is a conglomerate of nuclear industry corporations masking as [a non-profit organization](#). In November 2020, NRCan also contracted NWMO, with taxpayer money, to develop an Integrated Strategy for Radioactive Waste as a parallel but independent process from the Federal Radioactive Waste Management Policy. Essentially, the industry is empowered to develop a strategy that they themselves implement.
- For more information about the corporate capture of nuclear regulators, see [Ole Hendrickson’s presentation](#).

b. Privatization of nuclear waste management

- In 2014, all licenses for [Chalk River Laboratories \(CRL\)](#) were transferred to the federal crown corporation Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. (AECL), and the name was changed to Canadian Nuclear Laboratories (CNL). One year later [CNL was sold to a consortium of private companies](#), and AECL staff had been almost entirely swallowed up into the new privately managed CNL. The public institutions CRL and AECL no longer had any authority over industry.
- [The Chalk River Near Surface Disposal Facility is proposed by a consortium consisting of SNC-Lavalin and two Texas-based companies](#) that operate all federal nuclear facilities under contract and have strong interests in [“small modular reactors” and nuclear weapons](#)

5. Indigenous peoples and Canadians have a right to access information, to know the risks, and to say no to proposed nuclear waste storage in their community

The NWMO has been using a number of questionable tactics to convince two local communities in Ontario, South Bruce and Ignace, to host their Deep Geological Repository (DGR).

a. South Bruce

- “The municipality and NWMO can no longer ignore this expression of opposition against this project from residents and regional stakeholders.”- [Citizen group keeps up fight against nuclear waste dump](#)
- “We were never consulted when the nuclear power industry came into our territory. Since the 1960s this massive industry has had impacts on our lands, waters, the animals and on our communities.”[Saugeen Ojibway Nation members hold ceremony to remind people of their responsibility to Earth and water](#)
- “The Nuclear Waste Management Organization’s 9 Step process is not community driven. It is NWMO driven, with the sole objective of successfully developing, managing, and operating the world’s first high-level radioactive waste deep geological repository (DGR). The NWMO’s process has not been created to earn the social license of the community to approve this project. The process has been created and implemented to manage community opinion such that a very small group of decision-makers, such as a majority of the Council of the Municipality of South Bruce, will vote to approve, despite community objections.” - [Protect South Bruce - No Nuclear Waste](#)

b. Ignace

- “In what’s referred to as “Canada’s Plan,” the Nuclear Waste Management Organization (NWMO) is looking for a place to bury 4.8 million bundles of used nuclear fuel. Indigenous communities in both those areas are being courted and having the DGR concept pitched to them by the NWMO.”- [Indigenous communities courted as nuclear industry looks for place to put used fuel - APTN](#)
- “One thing they don’t realize is that they are in our territory, 55,000 square miles of Treaty 3,” Mr. Kavanaugh said. “All the waters in that area flow toward our lakes and river systems.” - [In Northern Ontario, governments engage in a two-faced climate change response](#)
- “And as well as a potential surge in Ignace’s economic fortunes if the deep geological repository (DGR) goes ahead, there is also NWMO money flowing into the community now, just for considering the project.” [Opportunity for youth, or sacrifice zone? Community reaction to nuclear waste burial plan is mixed - APTN](#)

c. Other communities

- Nuclear Waste Management Organization (NWMO) of Canada bribing struggling towns to have nuclear waste dump - [Nuclear waste debate divides Northern town](#)
- “Between 2010 and 2013, NWMO pumped over \$471,000 into Pinehouse coffers trying to convince residents that nuclear waste would be the answer to the community’s

poverty and associated social problems.” - [How the Nuclear Waste Management Organization targeted Pinehouse](#)

- “Members of the U.S. House of Representatives are calling on President Joe Biden to formally oppose Canadian plans to permanently store nuclear waste at a facility near Lake Huron.” - [Lawmakers oppose plan for nuclear waste storage near Great Lakes](#)

d. Indigenous declarations on nuclear issues:

- Indigenous communities have been vocal about their concerns with the way nuclear waste is being managed.
 - [Anishnabek/Iroquois' Five Principles of Radioactive Waste Management](#)
 - [Wolastoq Grand Council Resolution: Nuclear energy developments and nuclear waste use and disposal on Wolastokuk \(Mar 2021\)](#)
 - [Ontario uranium refinery faces pushback from Mississauga FN over licence extension](#), Nov 2021
 - Communication from Kabeowak Algonquin FN to PM Justin Trudeau, on why they “object to CNSC continuing to lead the assessment processes” for the proposed NSDF at Chalk River and the proposed Micro Modular Reactor Project at Chalk River; focuses on components of the constitutional Duty to Consult, [see this link](#)
 - [Joint Declaration on Radioactive Waste Transport and Abandonment](#)
 - [Anishinabek /Iroquois Joint Declaration of 2017](#)
 - [Chiefs of Ontario Resolution on Alternatives to Nuclear Energy \(Feb 2021\)](#)
 - [Indigenous Declarations on Nuclear Issues](#) - a compendium 2017-2021

6. Proposed Small Modular Nuclear Reactors is a distraction from climate action, and will add to the nuclear waste inventory

In recent years, there have been proposals for Small Modular Nuclear Reactors (SMRs or SMNRs). SMRs are nuclear reactors that produce less than 300 megawatts of electricity. They are being proposed as potential energy sources in remote areas, but also to replace aging conventional CANDU generating stations such as LePreau in New Brunswick. In 2020, Minister of Natural Resources Canada Seamus O'Regan announced that SMRs will be essential to meeting Canada's climate change goals. - [Five things about Canada's proposed small modular nuclear reactors](#)

Over 100 environmental groups have determined that these “next generation” nuclear reactors are a dirty, dangerous distraction from tackling the climate crisis. “Nuclear energy is not green, not clean, too costly and too slow to build.” - [CELA Media Release: Groups say federal funding of new nuclear reactors is a “dirty, dangerous distraction” from tackling climate change](#)

- **Small Modular Reactor (SMR) development is too slow to address the climate crisis.** The [2020 World Nuclear Industry Status Report](#) says that developing new nuclear energy is too slow to address the climate crisis – as well as more expensive – compared to renewable energy and energy efficiency. No SMRs have yet been built and the

models being proposed will take a decade or more to develop. Experts agree SMRs cannot be brought on stream in time to address the climate emergency. Putting efforts into this theoretical solution undercuts all the resourcing and prioritizing we need to do to maximize truly renewable energy generation options.

- **SMRs are more expensive than renewable energy:** A [Canadian study](#) found that energy from small nuclear reactors would be up to ten times the cost of renewable energy. In the past decade, the cost of building solar, wind power and battery storage has gone down dramatically, while the cost of building new nuclear reactors has gone up. Small reactors will be even more expensive per unit of power than the current large ones.
- **SMRs: dirty and dangerous?:** The new “small” reactors, proposed to be built across Canada, will produce radioactive waste of many kinds. [The Canadian Nuclear Laboratories themselves suggest](#) SMRs will add substantially to the nuclear waste inventory, which we currently don't effectively manage.
- Some of the proposed models would extract plutonium from irradiated fuel, worsening **concerns about weapons proliferation** and creating new forms of radioactive waste that are especially dangerous to manage. SMRs can contribute more to concerns about nuclear proliferation because these small reactors are less efficient than large reactors and so create more waste. - [SMRs: small modular reactors in Canada, explained](#)
- [The proposed nuclear reactors \(SMRs\) for New Brunswick](#) - “The information available on the government and NB Power websites about the SMR projects and investments is presented as nuclear industry promotion. In our briefing paper, we provide independent information from credible sources.”

7. Environmental and health impact of radioactive waste from milling and mining uranium to refineries.

The process of mining uranium for the nuclear reactors also generates massive amounts of waste and leaves lasting health and environmental impacts, From radiation exposure in workers to the contamination of clean lakes with radioactive water. All of Canada's current uranium mines are located in northern Saskatchewan.

- [Uranium Exploration and Mining in Quebec](#) - a plea for Quebec to follow the examples of Nova Scotia and British Columbia, 2014
- [Uranium: The shape shifter](#) Dec, 2021, Dr. Gordon Edwards
- [Dr. Edwards: Health Dangers of Uranium Mining & Dr. Gordon Edwards's Speech: The Health Dangers of Uranium Mining \(Greenland; Jun 11 2016\)](#)
- [Potential Human Health Effects of Uranium Mining, Processing, and Reclamation](#)
- [Potential health and psychosocial impacts of uranium development in Eeyou Istchee](#)
- The industry protects itself by silencing personnel about the health impacts of a partial meltdown from a test sodium reactor,, and got away with that for decades while cancers abounded in the surrounding area - [In the Dark of the Valley, a documentary.](#)
- Examples of uranium mines and their impacts:
 - Uranium City, SK [Uranium City – What happened to the miners?](#)
 - Gunnar Mine, SK: [A visit to the Gunnar mine](#) & [Gunnar Mine Site Remediation Project in Northern Saskatchewan](#)

8. The risk of nuclear weapon proliferation

- [Too Heavy A Price To Pay?](#) – Dr. Gordon Edwards’ summary of a short history of Canadian uranium as a nuclear weapon (pgs 4-7).
- Plutonium could be recovered from used nuclear fuels to produce nuclear weapons. [Non-proliferation experts send letter of concern over New Brunswick nuclear project](#)
- Ending the Global Security Threats of Nuclear Power
 - [Ending the Global Security Threats of Nuclear Power](#)
- SMRs open the doors for more nuclear weapon programs.
 - [Canada re-engages in the Nuclear Weapons Business with SMRs](#)
 - [Small Modular Reactors and Proliferation /Tolerance of Nuclear Weapons](#)

KEY ALLIES/ORGANIZATIONS WORKING ON THE ISSUE

- [Nuclear Waste Watch](#)
- [Radioactive Waste Policy Review](#)
- [The Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility](#)
- [Durham Nuclear Awareness](#)
- [Concerned Citizens of Renfrew County and Area](#)
- [Ontario Clean Air Alliance | Working for a clean, green energy future](#)
- [Lake Ontario Waterkeeper](#)
- [Coalition for Responsible Energy Development in New Brunswick - CRED-NB](#)
- [We the Nuclear Free North](#)
- [Clean Green Saskatchewan](#)
- [Protect our Waterways/Protect South Bruce - No DGR](#)

FACEBOOK GROUPS: TO KEEP YOU UP TO DATE!

- [Say NO to Cameco](#)
- [Citizens Concerned About Nuclear Waste in Ignace](#)
- [Protect South Bruce: No DGR](#)
- [Radioactive Waste : Act Now for a 7,000 Generations Plan](#)
- [We the Nuclear Free North](#)
- [OFWCA - CNL Radioactive Waste Watch](#)