

## Criminal Code

money; and this is a question which is still being considered by the City of Ottawa authorities. They are still battling over who is going to pay for the sewage treatment plant. Ottawa feel they cannot afford to handle it, and are not to blame for all the sewage which comes down the Ottawa river. In Winnipeg the same situation has now developed.

There is another press clipping from the *Winnipeg Free Press* of April 28, 1958, which is headed, "\$200 Million for Sewage Treatment", and this clipping states as follows:

Treatment of all greater Winnipeg sewage before it reaches the Red river would cost the city and its suburbs more than \$200 million, Winnipeg city council was told Monday night.

I imagine that an amount such as \$200 million is beyond the means of a city of the size of Winnipeg, and that the authorities there would feel they could not put this type of plan into operation without aid from some other source such as the provincial or the federal government.

On June 6, 1958 I have another clipping from the same paper headed, "Red River too Dirty for Skiing", which states as follows:

The Winnipeg ski club has been refused permission to water ski on the Red river due to river pollution.

The Winnipeg parks board, which received a request from the ski club to water ski on the river, denied permission after receiving a report on pollution content from Dr. R. G. Cadham, city medical health officer.

The ban does not affect swimming—but applies only to the use of the river as a take-off area for skiing.

It is only logical, in my opinion, that if the water is getting too polluted for water skiers to fall into, it must also be getting too polluted for swimming. If this pollution continues in such lakes as lake Winnipeg, the population increasing as it is and in view of our increasing need for good clean beaches—and in lake Winnipeg we certainly have some very very fine beaches—we will find that the people of Manitoba no longer have the beaches they need for recreational purposes during their week ends and holidays.

I would like to give one other instance of something which happened a few years ago in the lake Winnipeg area, to illustrate how no one knew where or how to tackle the problem or who to blame for it. May I mention an article in the *Winnipeg Free Press* dated May 23, 1953 headed, "Oil Debris Brings Disaster to Beach". On this occasion oil flooded into the river and was all driven on the shore by the ice when the wind shifted on lake Winnipeg. All this oil debris was brought right on to the shore and to the people who lived there it was just as big a disaster as the Red river flood.

On May 28, 1953 the *Winnipeg Free Press* had an article headed, "Irate Beach Mayor Hits Apathy Toward Oil Mess", and stated as follows:

An irate mayor Pat Irwin of Winnipeg Beach Thursday blasted politicians in particular and the public in general for the lack of interest in the plight of the town.

The beach resort, its lake shore piled sky high with oil-soaked brush and deadwood, had little hope of clearing off the mess in time for the summer season unless it gets help fast, Mayor Irwin told the *Free Press*.

This was on May 28, 1953, and then on May 29, 1953 the source of this oil was traced. It could have come from a commercial establishment in the town of Selkirk, the Manitoba rolling mill, although this was not proved. The *Winnipeg Free Press* says on May 29, "Rolling Mill Offers Help to Clear Oil"; and then there is a subheading, "Has 'Moral Obligation' to Winnipeg Beach, says Manager".

In all these things, however, when it comes down to a point of law there is no way of prosecuting or fixing the blame for this kind of pollution. This water pollution, as I mentioned earlier, is not peculiar to Manitoba, although we have our share of it. It is prevalent right across Canada, and I notice that they have set up a commission in Ontario to study this problem, as it has been studied in the prairie provinces. However, these matters are still just being studied and no concrete action is being taken at all. This matter is certainly not going to correct itself.

I wish to refer again to the remarks made by the present Prime Minister (Mr. Diefenbaker) on February 28, 1956, as recorded at page 1634 of *Hansard*. He referred at that time to the March, 1956 issue of *Rod and Gun* which contained an editorial in these words:

*Rod and Gun* readers will remember that pollution from the area of the city of Edmonton swept down the 400 miles of the North Saskatchewan river to Prince Albert in neighbouring Saskatchewan. It so affected the taste and purity of the water there that residents of P. A. were quite rightly up in arms over the whole thing. The water was unfit for human consumption—especially if you were the human that had to drink it. It is also almost certain that it had killed every game fish in the river over that 400 miles . . . There was enough evidence of dead fish around the P.A. water intake to further discourage the residents of that fine city.

In all the uproar that followed . . . the most significant thing to come out was that there is no legal machinery to properly handle pollution of interprovincial waterways. In fairness to the firm in Edmonton that some investigators feel was responsible for the first outburst it must be stated that they have, without any pressure from anyone, spent over \$150,000 to try to reduce the noxious properties of the waste water they discharge into the river. However, just because one firm has done this is no guarantee that others will follow suit. And it may be stated with certainty that more than one Edmonton industry is discharging