

Criminal Code

make this decision because, regardless of what route they take, they will be damned. The people in the Sea island community have no desire to see the new, modern covered wagons in the form of garbage trucks coming over from the city of Vancouver. I think it is estimated that these covered wagons will be proceeding at a rate of approximately one a minute and one of the routes that they will likely follow is through the residential area in Sea island.

As I have mentioned because of these two points I feel very strongly on the matter of water pollution. I feel that the city of Vancouver and possibly the provincial government are prepared to sacrifice the little island of Sea island in order to save the city of Vancouver a few million dollars of expenditure occasioned as a result of their lack of foresight. In the modern cities in the country where there are no Richmond in which to dump their garbage they have managed to dispose of the sewage through primary and secondary plants. If the city of Vancouver went to the expense of providing a secondary plant it would be possible to dump the effluent directly into English bay because I think the final product—I am informed that this is so, not being a sewage engineer—has the same consistency or the same purity as the glass of water which I hold in my hand. They could thus avoid causing a situation which will be very obnoxious to the municipality of Richmond. But as I mentioned, the difficulty has been the lack of foresight of the city of Vancouver and the matter of cost of perhaps a few million dollars.

I should also mention that some of the more advanced cities, with reference to their garbage disposal, provide adjacent to the primary and secondary plants a grinding-up unit by which the garbage can be ground up and then can be disposed of through the sewage plant. If the city of Vancouver were to adopt this expedient I feel the problem would be solved to the satisfaction of all parties concerned.

With reference to the problem of sanitary fill, I should like at this time to suggest to the Vancouver city fathers—inasmuch as they seem to think that Sea island would be an adequate place for the sanitary fill—that I believe in the area close to the centre of town in False creek, which is in the riding of my friend the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Taylor), there is a suitable area which could be quite adequately filled with this particular sanitary fill. Since the city fathers have extolled the numerous advantages I feel that perhaps they would like to take advantage of the situation in order to have this result brought about. The city was extremely anxious to have the sanitary

[Mr. Drysdale.]

fill shoved into Sea island; in fact they were so anxious that they paid the cost of taking three or four of the members of the Richmond municipal council and a couple of Vancouver people down to the San Francisco region. If I might be permitted to do so, I should like to quote briefly from an editorial in the *Richmond Review*. The editorial is headed, "A Dump is a Dump is a Dump" and it reads in part as follows:

The residents of Sea island are understandably angered at the proposal, made by the city of Vancouver, that it should be permitted to set up a garbage dump (politely referred to as a "sanitary fill") on the western shore of their island home. They may be counted on to do everything humanly possible (aided by whatever assistance this newspaper can give them) to effectively kill such a scheme.

Having seen them at first hand, we can now say there isn't a single "sanitary fill" in the entire San Francisco bay region we would be willing to see smuggled up to Sea island.

They are what they are—dumps, with flies and millions of seagulls and rats, odours and flying paper.

The editorial concludes, and I think it actually hits the real difficulty in the city of Vancouver:

Only Vancouver officials know the answer to that one. We suspect it's a mere matter of dollars, and the gulf waters provide the cheapest hole to be found close at hand. If so, it's another of the reasons why we suggest those same officials are justifiably earning for their city the title "Slobtown".

I would like to conclude by saying that in speaking to this matter of pollution, and speaking as a lawyer, I realize the jurisdictional and constitutional difficulties in implementing the motion of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Stefanson) with relation to this particular situation. I hope, nevertheless, that the situation can be rectified so that one municipality is not sacrificed at the expense of a larger neighbour. I know that the motto of the city of Vancouver is, "By Land and By Sea We Prosper", and I would say in conclusion that I hope it is not going to be "By land and by sea we prosper at the expense of Richmond".

Mr. Percy Vivian (Durham): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon on the motion of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Stefanson) the house has, I think, heard a great deal of interesting information on a subject which is of considerable importance to Canada, not only for its own sake but also in relation to some of its international aspects. Throughout the debate two things seem to have been stressed, the matter of urgency and the matter of responsibility, and this motion has the practical effect of directing the attention of the government to the problem in the hope that action