

Governance – Sub-national players in an international context

Theresa McClenaghan
Canadian Environmental Law Association
May 2010

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARIES – Room for sub-national players?

- ▶ International boundary – US / Canada national role has been recognized for over 100 years
- ▶ Boundary Waters Treaty and IJC are long in place but there is much room for them to be more proactive
- ▶ National governments would have to provide that space such as through more references and resources

Governance re-examined

- ▶ Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement – topic of governance is major aspect of the current re-negotiation – explicit inclusion of states, provinces, First Nations, municipal governments and public would help with governance issues

Sub-national players are key in Great Lakes context

- ▶ Much relevant action is at the provincial and state level – for example in the Great Lakes St. Lawrence River Basin Sustainable Water Resources Agreement and its implementation through the US Compact and States' legislation; and through Ontario's and Quebec's legislation; in particular as these lead to development and adoption of the relevant programs

Sub-national role in key actions

- ▶ Canadian side – the Canada Ontario agreement requires implementation action by Ontario as well as Canada to meet the GLWQA objectives. (The current COA was just recently extended for a short time while the GLWQA is renegotiated).
- ▶ Much of the provincial and state cooperation on water quality happens through participation in IJC bodies, Great Lakes Governors etc.
- ▶ But apart from the water quantity agreement, these efforts are not usually direct state to province or province to province work on shared goals within an explicit framework

Limits of national and bi-national governance

- ▶ Provinces and states have interests in directly regulating actions such as industrial and manufacturing which may have emissions to water and air; and in other aspects of land use and property rights in the basin – and may not agree to approaches which constrain them in their decision making other than by their own laws and processes
- ▶ Expanding water quality management to watershed and basin approaches that cross borders might assist

Going forward

- ▶ Co-operative cross border programs with shared goals may be welcomed which can be adapted to each jurisdiction's own set of laws
- ▶ A major uncertainty regarding effectiveness remains the ongoing extent of resourcing the various Great Lakes agreements, programs and legislation; and the difficulty to ensure long term appropriate resourcing levels.

Conclusion

- ▶ Great Lakes governance structures have de facto included sub-national governments; going forward their role must be highlighted, formalized, and room must be made for First Nations, municipal governments, and the public
- ▶ Ironically both greater structure providing for sub-national governments and other players and greater access to Great Lakes governance are necessary to achieve the many diverse goals of Great Lakes protection from toxics reduction to habitat protection