

**DANIEL T. KILDEE**  
5TH DISTRICT, MICHIGAN

**COMMITTEE ON  
FINANCIAL SERVICES**

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON  
HOUSING AND INSURANCE**

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON  
MONETARY POLICY AND TRADE**

**SENIOR WHIP**

**DEMOCRATIC POLICY AND  
COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE**



**Congress of the United States**  
**House of Representatives**  
**Washington, DC 20515**

WASHINGTON OFFICE

227 CANNON HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING  
WASHINGTON, DC 20515  
(202) 225-3611  
(202) 225-6393 (FAX)

DISTRICT OFFICE

801 SOUTH SAGINAW STREET  
PLAZA LEVEL  
FLINT, MI 48502  
(810) 238-8627  
(810) 238-8658 (FAX)

**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE**

Thursday, May 7, 2015

Contact: Mitchell Rivard, 202-595-4885, [mitchell.rivard@mail.house.gov](mailto:mitchell.rivard@mail.house.gov)

**Statement by Congressman Dan Kildee on Canadian Joint Review Panel  
Report**

*Congressman Dan Kildee (MI-05) issued the following statement after a Canadian joint review panel submitted its final report to Canada's Minister of the Environment, Leona Aglukkaq:*

"I am disappointed in the Joint Review Panel's report, which is fundamentally flawed in several ways.

"First, the Joint Review Panel failed to fully examine any other potential sites to bury nuclear waste in Canada. It's hard for me to accept the Joint Review Panel's conclusion that a site less than a mile from Lake Huron is the safest and most appropriate place to store millions of gallons of nuclear waste when they failed to even consider other potential sites. Surely in the vast landmass that comprises Canada, there has to be a more sensible place to bury nuclear waste than right next to the world's largest freshwater source, the Great Lakes.

"Nuclear waste is hazardous material that will remain radioactive for generations, and no person, panel or country can ever say with absolute certainty that there is no environmental risks. One only has to look at other nuclear accidents, including recently in New Mexico, where human error resulted in an accidental radiation release. Human error is always a possibility, and if an accident were to happen on the shores of the Great Lakes, a nuclear radiation release could endanger the freshwater supply for over 40 million people, both in the U.S. and Canada.

"It is also appropriate to raise questions of why Canada continues to move ahead with this particular nuclear waste site when they themselves had previously objected to a similar plan by the U.S. just a few decades ago. When the U.S. was considering a nuclear storage facility in the 1980s near the Great Lakes, Canada's then-Minister for External Affairs objected, saying such a site too close to a shared water basin was not appropriate. If nuclear waste stored within our shared waterways was too close for Canada, why is less than a mile from the Great Lakes appropriate now?

“Finally, the Joint Review Panel’s report does not take into consideration the growing opposition – in both the U.S. and Canada – to this nuclear waste storage site. To date, 154 municipalities, from Chicago to Toronto, have voiced opposition to Canada’s plan to permanently store nuclear waste next to the Great Lakes. So far, 20 Members of Congress – 10 Democrats and 10 Republicans – have also cosponsored my resolution seeking an alternative location.

“The Joint Review Panel’s conclusions are inconsistent and should not be certified by Canada’s Minister of Environment. Permanently storing nuclear waste less than a mile from the Great Lakes is an unnecessary risk and too much of a threat to the world’s largest supply of freshwater, which would be forever changed if they were to become contaminated with nuclear waste. I stand with the growing chorus of people in the U.S. and Canada speaking out in opposition to this plan and will continue to fight to protect our Great Lakes from harm.”

###