



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison





THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Monday, March 19, 1962

MR. CHAIRMAN: Health Division - Health Services, Item 2 . . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, at 5:30, I rose to say a few words about the matter of river pollution on the Red River and other streams. What I have to say can be kept at a minimum because of the very factual and well-documented speech given by the member for Selkirk. It seems to me that he outlined the problem, as far as the problem exists, in its entirety, and I would merely like to emphasize that this is a problem which even with the multi-million dollar sewage expansion program that the Metro council is going to undertake in the next several years, will not be solved with that alone. I was one of those who was present at a meeting in East St. Paul last summer when the residents there, out of sheer desperation, called a meeting, and at which were present the members of the executive of the Metropolitan Corporation and the people there were informed as to what would likely be done as far as improvement of sewage treatment is concerned, although they weren't told so at that exact time. A little later than a week after that meeting the story broke that the problem required from 20 to 30 million dollars expenditure. But at that meeting people were warned that the expansion of sewage treatment in itself would not be adequately effective. The Director in the Metropolitan area for Sanitation -- I don't know if that's his correct title -- at that time said that what was needed was an auxiliary program perhaps undertaken by this province, of diverting some water into the Assiniboine which would then act as a flush. I'd merely like to point out that if we are going to see Metro spend millions and millions of dollars for sewage treatment improvement, the province perhaps should be willing to spend some additional monies in order to make this program effective. It's better to have 90 or 100% effectiveness than to spend millions of dollars and have only 60 or 70% effectiveness, and this is more or less the general information that was given to the people there by experts in this field. I'm not going to deal with the problem that's created by the use of hard detergents -- that was done so well earlier this afternoon -- but I would like to point out to the Minister, who is in a sense answerable on this problem, that it was disturbing to the people out there to hear the Minister of Agriculture come out with that statement in the fall that the province would not consider any kind of program which would provide a diversion into the Assiniboine and thus provide flush water.

MR. HUTTON: I don't recall that the Minister of Agriculture ever said that or took that stand.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, that's rather comforting, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HUTTON: . . . . Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member rereads the newspaper report.

MR. SCHREYER: That's rather comforting to hear that, Mr. Chairman. I would take it then that the province is still -- the Minister is still considering this aspect of the problem. I would like -- I didn't really mean to be so critical; I don't know why the Minister is so touchy on that point -- (Interjection) -- In a lighter vein -- I was going to extend to him an invitation -- because I understand and I can appreciate that only by personal experience can anyone really begin to understand the seriousness of this problem of pollution on the Red and the horrible stench that seems to drive many people there to their wits' end during the summer months, and I would extend to the Minister an invitation to bring out a picnic lunch some evening in the summer and he and I can enjoy it on the banks of the Red River, so that he can understand just how serious this problem is. Seriously -- and that was serious too; that was a serious invitation -- seriously, it is not good enough to say that Metro is going to spend millions of dollars in sewage treatment improvement; it may take four or five years, and leave it that. It's not good enough and I would like very much to get some indication from this government as to whether they intend to provide an ancillary program, provide flush water for this problem by means of a diversion from Lake Manitoba into the Assiniboine River.

Now, I must confess in leaving the problem of the Red, that I am really not aware, not sure of the extent of this program of environmental sanitation that's carried out by the Minister's department. It looks pretty impressive to read the excerpts in the departmental report, but I have no hesitation in pointing out to the Minister that there are a good many people who feel

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.) . . . that there is not yet adequate inspection of rivers and streams as to pollution content, etcetera. For example, at this meeting in East St. Paul -- and I couldn't give them an answer at that time -- there were many people who thought that the pollution content of waters even upstream from Winnipeg was pretty dangerously high, and I am wondering if there is such a thing as a regular sampling or inspection program that is conducted by this branch of the department, and out in my own area there is the stream known as the mighty Brokenhead, the name of my constituency; I don't know -- it's a little smaller than the Mississippi, but it's a pretty important river to the people out there and what is particularly disturbing is the fact that on this river there are three tourist -- I don't know if you'd call them resorts -- but three tourist camps, and upstream from these three tourist camps during the summer I took the occasion to walk along the river and have a look for myself and I found there, as some people said I would find, all sorts of evidence of pollution; dead cows in the river, really a variety of carrion, and I don't know who's responsible for inspection of these smaller streams. I suppose it's pretty well a hopeless task to carry out inspection on all the rivers and streams in the inhabited part of this province, but where you have tourist camps it would seem to be fairly important that you have someone checking up on this, and I have not seen this to be the case. I would like to ask the Minister if there is, in fact, some sort of regular service of inspection program that is carried out? I know during the winter it doesn't matter much. In the spring the spring waters run off, so this pollution is not a problem, but in the summer, especially when the water level is low, it does become a problem and I would point out to the Minister that there is a lot of evidence of pollution in this smaller stream of which I spoke, and there doesn't seem to be anything done about it. Now we have statutes on the books about this problem, but you need some sort of inspection and enforcement.

MR. E. I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Chairman, might I for a moment get back from river pollution and sewage disposal, as serious as it is, to the other phase of the servicing of public in Manitoba is the supply of water and treating of water for human consumption. I wish, too, at this time to compliment the staff of the Department of Health that is in the field, and the assistance that they have given to various rural water treatment plants and systems that have been established through the past few years. But, Sir, there is one concern and one element of the production and treatment of water that has come up to the notice of the public -- notice to anybody that has been treating water and softening water through the uses of lime. As you know, I think it's a federal statute that the analysis of the contents of chicken feed and animal feed has to be contained on the bags that are supplied and sold in Manitoba, and I think elsewhere, but to bring it to a very explicit example, in using lime for water softening it requires a very high calcium lime, and apparently in Manitoba we don't produce a lime of a high enough calcium content to be suitable to treat water to a softening point in most of the places. This sounds kind of minor, if you wish to put it that way, but if you'll take under consideration the bad factors that come into the picture when all of a sudden the lime that has been supplied is sold to you again by the same supplier with a varying degree of calcium content. All it says on bag is "high calcium lime." Now it's true that it is higher calcium content than the plasterer's lime, but unless you can get a very extreme calcium content, you treat your water to a point that you have corrosive materials in your hot water tanks, hot water heating systems, and particularly, I am sure the Minister will agree with me, that in sterilizers and so forth in hospitals, it creates a corrosive action when you have to use a low grade of calcium lime for treatment of water. I would like to suggest to the Minister that, through his department, that people that are selling lime for water treatment plants should have the analysis on the bag, so that the operators do know whether they are getting a calcium lime of enough content to do the job that they are supposed to do. I could give you a good lesson and a good long story on the treatment of water and the way it affects, but I am sure there's not too many here have that problem, but it is a problem that's rising in Manitoba. As the more treatment plants go in the more softening of water goes in, and I would like this government, and through the Minister, take under consideration that for the use of water treatment that high calcium lime as supplied in Manitoba, that analysis should be on the bag so operators know what they're getting. We had eight months of adverse conditions in this one plant because of this fact, it's difficult to get the tests made, and after we finally got it we then had to go to BC for our supply of lime to get a high enough calcium content.

MR. A. J. REID (Kildonan): . . . . . industrial hygiene enter the picture, and I was just wondering if the Minister's department takes any action pertaining to foundries and gold mines where the employees work in the places of employment where they are given a yearly test for silicosis, and also, Mr. Chairman, I was looking through that little leaflet the Minister gave us on health and when we were speaking on contaminated meat and the health of the people of Manitoba, the Minister said their inspectors went into these plants and checked them regularly, but I notice here it had 13 field inspections and six office interviews pertaining to slaughterhouses, yet race tracks, which just operate part of the year -- maybe a couple of months of the year throughout Manitoba -- they had 19 field inspections, so it looks as if the department is more interested in race tracks than they are in the inspection of slaughterhouses.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to speak on some of these items at this time. With respect to the last statement, I don't think I need to inform the House that this is not a very fair statement of what I tried to convey to the House the other day. I think with respect of meat inspection -- I would first of all point out that the Department of Environmental Sanitation deals with all matters -- The Sanitary Control Commission, as the members know, is under this item, and the Department of Public Health, Engineering, Food Control, Industrial Hygiene and General Sanitation. As I pointed out to the House the other day, we have received certain recommendations from the department over the past two years -- we have been working on this -- with respect to the inspection of slaughtering houses and I do think I tried to convey to the House that we have a plan of action here and we're very anxious to get on with this with the federal authorities, because we don't feel that the best interests of the people in the meat industry and the people of Manitoba are served by putting on a provincial service when we can get the co-operation of the federal authorities to do this; and I indicated at that time I appreciated the resolution of the Honourable Member from Elmwood and I would assure the Honourable Member from Kildonan that we are terribly interested in this field of meat handling, and we do hope we can resolve this satisfactorily as soon as possible and as soon as we can get the concurrence of the federal authorities with respect to giving us the specifications of Canada Approved and so on.

Now, to deal with some of the questions that have been asked, I appreciate very much the statement from the -- and very excellent criticism and analysis of one of the problems facing the province as given by the Honourable Member from Selkirk, because I'm just beyond the honourable member, north of him, and the suds went all the way to Sans Souci, I think, and south into Matlock last year. He's referring to the hard detergents with the inorganic materials used in developing these detergents. They don't break down very readily in normal sewage and the common household detergents are in this category. Now, you may say what has the department done about this? Well, we do know that the analyses carried out on the Red River between Emerson and St. Adolphe showed concentrations of .15 to .3 parts per million of this detergent and, in other words, some of this is coming from the U.S.A. and after it passes through Winnipeg it picks up to about .5 parts per million, and this of course, any agitation of the water in certain climatic conditions produces this foam.

The department chemists advise me that the toxicity of the detergent in the water itself is no cause for alarm and we -- apparently the conclusion reached by a committee of the British Government on synthetic detergent was that there were no ill effects associated with the concentration normally encountered but recommended that of course possible long term treatment of such be kept in review, and aside from the . . . . . the main concern is that detergents present in water supply are associated with waste disposal and other objectionable pollution may also be present.

Now with respect to legislation we find out although a committee has been formed in Britain and it is said that legislation is being enacted in Germany, the investigations of our department have shown that while this is being studied in great detail I don't think there's any actual legislation to date that we know of. However, we are interested in this and the Sanitary Control Commission have latterly been talking about this and they feel that the method of attacking this is probably to get a public health engineer on the Advisory Engineering Committee of the International Joint Commission on Waterways, that this would be a proper method of getting the concern of the authorities south of the line because this is really a matter which is an international problem, and again, we are definitely going to bring this matter up with the

(Mr. Johnson (Gimli), cont'd.) . . . . . federal authorities. As a matter of fact the proper method apparently of going about this is for us to appeal to the federal government for an investigation under the Boundary Waters Treaty which apparently dates back to 1909. Now I'm giving the House this information because we have been aware of this and I know it is a matter which is going to have to concern both the Sanitary Control Commission and Metro authorities in the near future, and we feel that the two methods of tackling this are as I have indicated.

The thing I would like to point out, the Honourable Member from Selkirk did mention that possibly these inorganic detergents could pollute wells in the province. The Engineering Division of the government advised me, have advised me in the past, that this danger would largely come from lagoons containing such detergent effluent, and from the beginning of the lagoon development system, the development of lagoons in this province, we have — the department have always made sure that the lagoon has a clay or a pervious base to these part inorganic substances getting into wells. However, it's a point well taken and will certainly be kept in mind and it is very important. I think that while this doesn't offer any immediate solution I think in many cases such as this the problem is to recognize it and to press on with those things that will help. We all know these detergents; many are not made probably in this province, and this is both a federal and international matter.

Answering some of the specific questions with respect to the pollution of the river and the role of the provincial government, I have literally voluminous files with respect to the pollution of our two major water courses, and as you know the Sanitary Control Commission is the over-all authority, as it were, in the province, keeping an eye on the programs and an all-seeing eye on just what's happening across the province. And we do know that one of the reasons I recall we brought favour of Metro was that prior to the introduction of Metro the Sanitary Control Commission had jurisdiction, for instance, on one side of the river at Charleswood, and the Greater Winnipeg Sanitary District on the other side, and Metro has placed all these areas -- are now under one jurisdiction. And the Sanitary Control Commission has had meetings with myself and the Waste and Disposal Division of Metro Council, when they were presented with their consultant's reports, and these are very complicated engineering studies which certainly have to be interpreted to a layman, and Metro has decided to get on with the job right away on a phased program along the lines recommended by the plan in the Underwood McLennan study. And I think, when we think of extra water and water for flushing the river we must recall that the Shellmouth proposal has been approved and my information is that, for example, this would possibly deliver 450 cubic feet per second through the City but you can't look at it in that way because the agricultural and the uses of this increased flow after the dam is built would gradually probably deplete that amount of water coming through. And I think that in the first instance these things are developed for irrigation and agricultural purposes as I understand it.

The flow, for instance, in the river last year at low water was about 850 cubic feet per second, so you can get some idea of what has happened and I think there has to be a start made both in treatment, and it is being discussed I believe -- I have the understanding now that the Metro authorities hope to set up a review committee consisting of many technical people to continue to advise them as to the amount of waters which may be available to the city in the future and the efficiency of the sewage works which would be instituted in relation to the amounts of water that may be available, but I think we have to at this particular time consider extra waters coming through the Winnipeg area as more or less a bonus until such times as these projects are developed and the agricultural requirements are realized which will reduce any such flow.

The problem in East St. Paul, certainly one can understand it very well when one realizes how much of the sewage which has gone through the north end facility has gone through untreated due to the load and the real need to shore up that facility. In principle the Sanitary Commission concurs in measures which the consultant reports to them the recommendations which have been made to Metro and their interpretation of the phased program and we would hope -- I understand the Water and Conservation Branch are going to be part possibly of an advisory committee to continue to review the Metropolitan Winnipeg's program. I think this is proper because we do as a Sanitary Control Commission require a pretty -- we have to be kept into the picture pretty fully.

(Mr. Johnson (Gimli), cont'd.) . . . .

With respect to industrial establishments both the Greater Winnipeg Sanitary District and Metro have a surcharge, as I understand it, with industry and working with industry to remove objectionable waste in the river and this is something that will have to go forward as more and more industries come into the picture. We have nothing to be too proud of with respect to the BOD levels which occur in the wintertime and the low of water levels. I hope I'm not imparting that I'm an apologist for the Sanitary Control Commission. It does come under the over-all jurisdiction of this department and some extensive work is done all the time.

I would point out to the Member from Brokenhead that with respect to the Sanitary Commission's activities outside Metro, we are continually -- the Sanitary Control Commission is continually carrying out bacteriological chemical studies in the various rivers and, for instance, have been engaged in the past year in the Winnipeg River getting a base line and some studies made prior to the operation of the Atomic Plant facility on the edge of that river. They have carried out studies in the various rivers in rural areas. The Commission itself has the function of issuing licences to various villages and cities throughout the province and our record is that always primary treatment is insisted upon prior to discharge of effluent into the rivers and streams within our jurisdiction. I think that with whose responsibility it is to remove a cow from the banks of a river such as the honourable member has mentioned, I think within municipal borders, my understanding is that this is really a function of the local authorities in this area. I know in unorganized territory our sanitary inspectors, for instance, on their tours in these areas have on occasion come across such things and had them removed in those areas.

In reviewing the various projects for the function of this department as I've indicated, under the Environmental Sanitation Branch, who have the Public Health Engineering Division, and these are the group of men who service the -- , offer consultant services and so on to the municipalities with respect to sewage treatment plants, and operate courses for sewage plant operators, water standard analysis, public bathing premises, waste disposal systems of all kinds and engineering research;

The Bureau of Food Control is concerned with The Frozen Food Locker Plant Act, the meat and fish at the retail level, food equipment evaluation, food produce analysis, the consumer inquiries and so on, and milk, of course, the pasteurization of milk;

The Industrial Hygiene Department is responsible for silicosis etcetera and I would outline to the Committee because the question has been asked, "What about disease like silicosis?" Silicosis in the Province of Manitoba, for example, one of the industrial hazards in a mine, foundry, is the responsibility of the Workmen's Compensation Board, the Department of Mines and Resources, and the Bureau of Industrial Hygiene under this item, and the Compensation Board is responsible for paying allowances to men disabled by silicosis and in respect of medical examination and x-ray of workmen engaged in hazardous occupations these are delegated to the Health Department with the Compensation Board paying the cost. The Mines Branch of the Department of Mines & Natural Resources carries out regular inspections of the working of the mines underground and take in air sampling and dust sampling for estimation of silica content, and for this they apparently hire a full-time ventilation engineer. Now in our department, in Industrial Hygiene, we're responsible for the annual examination, medical examination and x-raying of all workmen engaged in prescribed occupations such as hard rock mining and foundries where there is a silica hazard, and some of these exams are carried out by personnel employed directly by the Bureau. In others they're carried out in our place by the medical departments, for instance of Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting, and we'll get the doctors there to carry out the physical examination. All x-rays are reported to the Health Department here and in the case of any abnormalities of course get picked up anywhere on x-rays routinely or on the regular yearly surveys are reported directly to the Department, and last year, in '61, 3,621 miners, 632 foundry men were examined in this manner and we have information on 40 cases of silicosis; 24 are miners with a rate of 8 per thousand, 16 in the foundries. We have in the past year had the four agencies I've mentioned in the Health, Mines Department and the compensation officials working together in this field, and some criticism was made that the examinations might not have been fully indicative of the actual pulmonary function of an individual, and I understand the department is going to be carrying out further testing with

(Mr. Johnson (Gimli), cont'd.) . . . . a vitalometer which is apparently an instrument which should be of some value in this field, and I have frankly, and I might as well tell the Committee, I have only in my experience as Minister -- there have been two cases where there were silico-tic changes in the lung. I think in both cases this did not really originate in this province. People say they came to Manitoba, where we felt on medical grounds that there was definite silico-tic change there, but they weren't disabled to the extent of being compensatable and in both instances, although I didn't think they should, they insisted on going back to work, and there is very little you can do in this area; and I've asked the Committee to sit down several times in this problem and as yet I haven't had any satisfactory solution.

On the whole the silicosis program is working well in that we are getting, I think, fairly extensive examinations done once a year and the departmental committee advise me that the experience here is very similar to other jurisdictions, but every year I think the problem of silicosis has been of concern to this committee so I thought I would have this material on hand to give you, these notes and a run-down on the problem. I think the solution to most things of this nature lies in prevention and continuous examination, and I think older miners who have a degree of silicosis have been advised. In one instance I wouldn't sign the certificate to allow the chap back in the mine, but he insisted on going back, and this is a very difficult thing to know what to do. I think the various testing though, the increased pulmonary -- increased tests, concentrating on more tests of vital capacity in pulmonary function will help a great deal.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister a . . . . question in connection with that problem. Those have that fish in that corner which the Honourable Member from Selkirk described, so why, they will likely get in by hook or crook to the Lake, and then they'll be caught and put on the menu of every household. Can this be prevented?

MR. PETERS: Mr. Chairman, under preventative medicines I am noticing here that . . .

MR. PAULLEY: . . . . question of Environmental Sanitation, I wonder if the Minister could tell us: Who are the members of the Sanitary Control Commission? How many are there on the Commission and what are their qualifications academically?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): The members of the Commission are Mr. W. J. Johnston, Mr. Ness Mudry, who is chief, and Mr. L. A. Kay. As you know, Mr. Johnston is Chairman of the Municipal Board and Mr. Mudry is Chief Planning Engineer for the Water Control and Conservation Branch and Mr. L. A. Kay is our Chief Public Health Engineer. This is the Commission, but the staff of the Commission includes a Mr. A. D. Sparling, who acts as secretary, and the chemist Mr. Lynch and during the summer months an engineering aide and a student are usually hired to assist with the samplings.

MR. PAULLEY: I take it, Mr. Chairman, that there are -- two on the Commission are the actual members of the Commission who are qualified or is there only one qualified personnel with proper training in the field of sanitation that's on the Board? The Minister mentioned the name of Mr. W. J. Johnston, with whom we're all aware of, but I doubt very much, in the field of sanitation whether that particular gentleman has very much technical knowledge.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): The Honourable Leader of the NDP said this afternoon he'd like some ordinary "joes" on the Hospital Commission. I think this is a very good appointment of an ordinary joe on the Sanitary Commission, and then we have, of course, two very highly technical qualified engineers with extensive experience in this area, especially Mr. Kay and Mr. Mudry, in his -- more in the Water Conservation branch, as full time members -- Mr. Kay is actually chairman of the commission -- and then you have your staff members. Mr. Sparling is a graduate public health engineer.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, I'm serious in asking the question because if people will read the description of the Honourable Member from Selkirk about the fish and we eat it, now what assurance have we got that we don't get a half-starving contaminated fish on our table?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, coming from the wonderful constituency of Gimli, that this has been of concern to me, but as I indicated in my remarks earlier the chemists in the department here inform me that the toxicity of the detergent itself in water is no cause for alarm, but recommended that in the long term view the degree of pollution by hard detergents is something we will have to keep in mind. From a chemical point of view I would think by the time the -- I guess the fish doesn't swallow water except what little he may drink -- by the time his body processes it would probably render the swallowed



(Mr. Johnson, (Gimli), cont'd.) . . . detergent a little innocuous and by the time it passed through the animal's liver and his bloodstream, I imagine it would be detoxified by the various processes there, and I am sure my honourable friend would boil the fish or bake it and I think this would cure the contaminants on the outside.

MR. MOGAT: The Member for Selkirk this afternoon made what I thought was an excellent contribution to the question of pollution, but I must confess that I am not happy with the reply that we got from the Minister on this, Mr. Chairman. He discussed at some length a number of subjects but didn't tell us what the government proposed to do about pollution, and this is a very serious matter and my colleague from Selkirk certainly pointed out the difficulties. One need only look at the clippings in the newspapers last summer to appreciate how serious this thing was. Back as early as last May, this is the Free Press, 23rd of May, one of the headlines then was, "Red could be a sewer by August, says official" and it went on to say, "that the river contains" and it is written at that time in the present tense, in May that was, "the river contains roughly 25 times as much sewage as the department considers hazardous for swimming and water skiing." It goes on to say that at this rate "it will be like an open septic tank." A little later on in the year, September, headline, "That familiar stink will likely worsen." A week later in September, "North Metro residents rise in anger at stench of river."

Now with all these difficulties, all these problems, the Minister hasn't told us what the government intends to do, Mr. Chairman. Now I've tried to follow what the Minister of Agriculture was saying on this subject because he's connected with this, and he had a number of statements to make earlier this year, but after reading all his statements I can't find out what he proposes to do either, because one week he says one thing and the next week he says something else. Back in November, for example, there was a report, and this is the Winnipeg Free Press, November 30th, and the headline is, "Report backs canal; could relieve sewage grief in Metro. Strong support for a \$1 million channel which would carry water from Lake Manitoba to the Assiniboine River is contained in the report in the hands of the Provincial Government," and on with some details about it. Then we see on the 21st of December a great headline, "Province upholds flushing canal, \$19 million help to Metro claimed" -- this is the Tribune, December 21st. "The Provincial Government hopes to save Metro voters about \$19 million by digging a flushing canal from Lake Manitoba to the Assiniboine River in 1967." And this, Mr. Chairman, the following part is in quotes, presumably from some official in my honourable friend's department, and it says and this, as I say, is in quotes: "The people of Greater Winnipeg are entitled to save \$19 million by building a \$1 million canal which would dilute river waters and do much of the work envisaged in a \$20 million sewage treatment scheme." It goes on; later on in the article it says, "These statements follow the public meeting in Portage, Wednesday night, called to protest plans to build a diversion. Agricultural Minister George Hutton defended the plan against bitter opposition from Al Hochbaum, Director of the Delta Waterfowl Station."

Then we have another headline, December 29th: This one says, "Canal sure -- Hutton -- '67 earliest starting date." Mind you, he's not quite as rapid as one would assume he should be in the light of the seriousness of the condition, but he's sure it's going to be done. Then the Tribune, the following day, a couple of days later, no, a day later, the 30th says, "Never said anything. Hutton astounded by Metro remarks" and he finishes off the article by saying, "I have never made any public statements about sewage disposal in Greater Winnipeg because I don't know anything about that field." Now, Mr. Chairman, where exactly does this government stand on the matter of river pollution here in the City of Winnipeg? It's all well and fine to say that this is a metro responsibility, that under the Metro Act this has been transferred to Metro, but Mr. Chairman, Metro has no control over the amount of water flowing down these rivers. My honourable friends, the government have, in conjunction I will admit with the federal government and in conjunction, insofar as some of our rivers are concerned, with the American Government, but they are the people on the spot here and they simply cannot shrug off their responsibility and say, "Let Metro do it." They have a responsibility in this. Now, so far we've had no statement of policy from this government; none whatever. This situation is extremely serious and it's high time that the government said what it proposes to do about it and when.

Mr. JOHNSON (Gimli): This government will give my honourable friend his answer. My honourable friend forgot to mention that last summer he went around the province talking of a hidden report, 1952 to '55. He was a member of this House, I believe. This was in the library with a very wide distribution. This pointed out relatively the same problem as the further report presented to me last summer on the valuation of the Red River, which incidentally was a post graduate thesis of a student who was writing a thesis on his public health degree. We got him some assistance under a federal grant and this more or less brought up the pollution problem in Greater Winnipeg, but I would remind my honourable friend that this is a problem that has been building up since 1894. It was a long time ago and it is something that won't be cured overnight, but the people of Manitoba have some expectations that something is going to be done about it now, and -- just wait a minute -- we have as its control commission -- the Metro authorities have had an extensive survey done by consulting engineers. These engineers were called in in the dying days of the Greater Winnipeg Sanitary District and carried on by Metro, submitted a very voluminous report, which over the years, calls for I believe about \$35 million expenditure which has to be done in stages. The government has also pointed out that while certain works are being conducted in rural areas such as the Shellmouth Dam, that we must not -- at this stage it's going to be some years before further waters can be made available in Greater Winnipeg and then I would call it a bonus in view of the agriculture and irrigation needs of the people along the course of these waterways, and this is a very complicated, difficult subject and I am sure the Minister of Agriculture can defend himself with respect to his work in this field, but certainly the officials of the Water and Conservation Branch and the Chief Public Health Engineer, who is Chairman of the Sanitary Commission have been in constant touch with us, and we in turn with the Water and Waste Division of Metropolitan Winnipeg.

But let us be reasonable, too, about this whole matter. To make the Red River as clean as you could drink the water would take \$200 million, and I think authorities all over the world realize the fact that in addition to major water and waste disposal or treatment plants and lagooning and so on, that the rivers can never be brought to the ideal position that some people think is possible. It will require three to four years to develop the major plants in this area. I feel very strongly that since coming to office and knowing the condition of this river, that I could see very soon after coming in that Metro or one jurisdiction in Metro Winnipeg was the only solution in the long run to tackling the tremendous problems facing Greater Winnipeg; could also see it in the most elementary study of the subject that you can never abandon the river as a vehicle of carrying at least effluent and some waste to the lake. However, the thing had been neglected to the point where some immediate action is being considered and the two extensive consultant reports have been studied and have been wedded and a plan has been put forward by the Metropolitan authorities and we have said to the Metropolitan Authorities, in order, rather than giving an annual report to our Sanitary Control Commission, we feel that a continuing committee of review, including the chairman of that commission, should be right in the picture, possibly in an advisory capacity with other advisors, in order to keep the matter under constant scrutiny and examination. Our proper function is to test the water going into Metro, to offer all the help and advice we can from what we know of situations, and to again test the water leaving Metro. But let us be perfectly fair about this. Reports were made in 1955. Last summer we were accused of hiding this report -- it was in the library. This sort of accusation going around -- the government neglectful, forgetful, unconcerned. These are just simply not fair statements. We are concerned. We're very concerned, and a great deal has been done that is being completely overlooked by those who are talking on this subject. What is being done? We contacted the Metro authorities; we took some action. After, we met with the Water and Waste Division of Metro to discuss in general the studies which were made by these authorities, and following their submission to us that they had a plan of action which would of necessity take at least three years before they could create for instance the shoring up the north end plant by putting in extended trunk sewers and secondary treatment in that facility which was collecting the biggest pollutional load. Secondly, they decided to set to, to have further consultations with an advisory group re the possibility of developing some lagoons at the south end of the City. In the meantime they discussed with us the possibility of increased river flow which I have outlined to you -- the one thing that has been approved and is going ahead and I've told you the amount of water even such a dam would develop in Greater Winnipeg,

(Mr. Johnson, (Gimli), con'td.) . . . but I must point out that the amount of water required to minimize the development of works is a pretty fantastic figure. You would need at least 2,000 CFS per second going through the City here to control the pollutional load that is there at the present time. And when you think of the time ahead, and so on, it's quite great.

Now we have said to the Metro authorities within the Greater Winnipeg area that the water control and conservation program you must realize is predicated on the priorities established under various acts administered by the Department of Agriculture and Conservation, and it is quite possible that the increase in these minimal flows will be achieved in the future. But it would be well that we keep in mind that necessary works will have to be constructed with various priorities other than dilution of municipal waste. We're trying to work with the Metro authorities in the technical areas as much as possible, offering advice, the advice of the Commission with men of experience. We're trying to help them interpret what we consider the minimum amount of works that are required in Greater Winnipeg in the next five to ten years in order to relieve the river. But after 70 years of hit and miss projects, especially in the last 10 or 15 years, this is a tremendous problem to all Manitobans, not only the Winnipeg people. And we think the proper role is to play the same advisory, in the same capacity as we do in other municipal jurisdictions. There is an especial problem here and it's quite possible that increased flows through Winnipeg will certainly augment if the treatment works it may be established, but as we said again these are predicated on the needs of the Department of Agriculture and Conservation.

MR. PAULLEY: I've listened with great interest to my friend the Honourable the Minister of Health. It takes me back to about the year 1954 when I first became a member for the first session after I was elected to this Legislature. It takes me back further too, Mr. Chairman, to the time when I was a member of the Greater Winnipeg Sanitary District, because what the Minister has said tonight is exactly the same things that were said by the former administration of the same problem. I think as far as the whole question is concerned that neither one, neither the former administration nor the present administration has taken into due consideration the problems concerned. If I recall correctly, back in about 1951 or '52 the Sanitary District of the Greater Winnipeg area on instructions from the then-Chairman of the Sanitary Control Commission of the Province of Manitoba, who, if memory serves me right, was the Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs at that time, Mr. Murray Fisher, instructed the Sanitary organization of the Greater Winnipeg area to undertake steps to clear up the pollution in the Red and Assiniboine Rivers at that time. I just don't recall whether or not I have the name of the firm correctly but I believe it was a name of Alvin, Burdock and Howe of Chicago that made extensive examinations into the problem, and made recommendations as to a certain number of steps that should be taken at that time to clear up the then pollution. If memory serves me correctly the expenditures at that time were going to be somewhere in the magnitude of \$12 million. It was felt at that time, and I think properly so, as it is today, that this additional expenditure was beyond the financial capabilities of the Greater Winnipeg area. An appeal was made for considerable financial assistance to the former administration, which was not forthcoming, as an appeal is now being made to the present administration for aid in this very important matter. So I say, Mr. Chairman, that I think it is a truism in this regard that there has been no difference between either the Liberals or the Conservative in an attempt to clean up this problem. The Minister has indicated to us tonight that the matter is still under consideration, that we hope that we will be able to have a solution to this problem before too long. If I recall correctly it was exactly the same attitude as Ministers of Health in the former administrations stated before this House.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it is time that this attitude stopped; that we must have a concrete program and proposals to lay before the residents of the Greater Winnipeg area. I don't think that it's sufficient to longer put this off and to say that this is directly a responsibility of Metro government. This is a provincial problem as well. I mentioned this this afternoon just in speaking of roads, that we're attempting to attract people into Manitoba and into Greater Winnipeg as tourists, and I suggest on this basis alone that financial aid and rapid action should be taken by our provincial organizations and government in conjunction with Metro. After all, this scheme that we have in the Greater Winnipeg area at the present time was originally constructed in co-operation with the federal government, the Province of Manitoba and

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . the area municipalities, or most of them, as a relief project back in the thirties. It might be argued that at that particular time those in charge of drafting this particular plan did not take into consideration the future growth of the Greater Winnipeg area. But notwithstanding that the fact of the matter is that the sewage disposal facilities and the reduction of the pollution in the Red River itself is not sufficient to take care of the increase in the industrial waste which is entering into the sanitary system as well as the additional waste as the result of the growth of the Greater Winnipeg area, and also due to the fact that some of our provincial laws as I understand it, have been changed and that area municipalities who previously did not belong to the sanitary district are now obliged to join up in what we used to call the Greater Winnipeg Sanitary District. I suggest that here is a time for a revision and a new look at this whole matter. I would suggest that here, because of the fact that in the original design and installation of the sanitary disposal facilities in the Greater Winnipeg area, that we have the participation of the federal authorities, the provincial government and the area municipalities and of course, as we know, under the Metro Act this portion of the area municipalities is now under the jurisdiction of Metro. But I suggest that maybe it would be a good idea to get as partners in the expansion of these facilities the three levels of government that we had in the original instance.

I do know that there has been some study given to building of lagoons in some of the out-lying suburbs and suburbs of the Greater Winnipeg area. I know this has been considered in, I believe, Fort Garry, St. Vital and in the Transcona area, but nothing has been done other than a study. I think in these studies the question of lagoons in the outside areas has been more or less rejected, at least at the time being. But as I say, Mr. Chairman, this is a problem that we can no longer say, why didn't you do it when, or why aren't you doing it now. I think this is a problem which affects all of us in Manitoba, irrespective of where we may reside; it's a problem that requires immediate attention. It might be, as the forecast that I noted in the paper this evening of possible flooding in the lower reaches of the Red River, that we will have sufficient waters in the Red River for this summer to reduce the amount of pollution due to the fact of an increased amount of water in the waterway. It may be that we will get by this summer as a result of that, with a lot lesser problem than we had in the year 1961. But I appeal to the government to start real action in this. There's been enough studies. As I mentioned we had studies of this problem made while I was still Mayor of Transcona, before I came into this Legislature. I think there have been two or three studies made since. The indication is that there are still studies being carried on in respect of this. Let's stop our studying and let's clean up the situation.

The Leader of the Opposition made reference to a number of newspaper headlines, or articles, of statements of the Minister of Agriculture at least attributed to him at Portage la Prairie, and then made reference to some other press reports in which the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture said that I didn't say these things and the likes of that. But whether he said them or whether he didn't, whether the press reports are accurate or whether they're not, the fact of the matter remains, Mr. Chairman, that we have a problem here in the Greater Winnipeg area that is the concern of everybody in Manitoba. We are already being criticized as is Metro because of the burdens, financial-wise, that have been placed on the shoulders of Metro and the taxpayers of the Metro area. I suggest that the time has come for a revision, a reassessment of all of this province, and that all three parties concerned get together to clean up this mess. There's no reason, there's no reason at all in my opinion Mr. Chairman, why our federal authorities should not play a very major part in the necessary expenditures to clean up the Red River. It has been established that it is an international waterway. The federal government have recognized this, to some degree at least, by making a contribution to the floodway around the Greater Winnipeg area which will in no way help in solving this problem. There may be some that consider that this is also an international problem because it is an international waterway. May I suggest that the studies that have been made in the past have established that insofar as the pollution from the lower reaches of the Red River for the time it has travelled to get into this general area, the ill effects have been dissipated, but I do say again, Mr. Chairman, let's cut out the studying and let's get something done to solve this problem which is magnifying and increasing as the Greater Winnipeg area develops, as we have more industries particularly, as we have more packing plants and

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . industries of that particular type and industries that add to this pollution. Let's get on with the job. It can be solved. Various solutions have been laid before us. All that is required is to do the job, and it can be done.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, fortunately I haven't been here as long as the Honourable Leader of the NDP and therefore I can't take the time to lose the time of this Committee in talking about what wasn't done in the past. I say fortunately, because I don't think that the members of this Committee and I don't think the people of Manitoba are too interested in the past but rather in the present and in the future, and I do notice that when the Honourable Minister talks on this subject he doesn't seem to be his usual self. It seems to me that he's not convinced himself and therefore it is very difficult to convince the members of this Committee. He has talked for quite a while more or less insinuating that he was waiting for Metro to come in, that now Metro's in they could do it; they'll do something about it. We're told about studies, about reports, but we're still not given any assurance that anything is actually being done. Before Metro we had the Greater Winnipeg Sanitary Commission and this Commission was doing exactly what should be done by Metro, and I feel that it is rather unfair to try and blame Metro. Metro has been there less than one year and we sure know the trouble that they have now without trying to shove something like this on their shoulder. This is something that doesn't concern only Greater Winnipeg but all Manitoba. This is something that the federal government should come in; maybe the American Government should come in, and certainly the Manitoba government, the provincial government should have something to do with this. It is rather unfair to say, "Well we have our experts; we're telling Metro; we're talking with Metro, and we'll talk with Metro again next year, and they can go to library and get these different studies," and well it's Metro this and Metro that, but we haven't anything concrete at all. I think that it's obvious by listening to the Honourable Minister who is usually so confident because he's so sure of his pet projects and he has confidence in them, he's sincere. Now today he's evading everything. I wonder if he can really tell us, to stand up and say, "Well this is Metro's baby so let Metro do it."

He's talked about the past a little bit like the Leader of the NDP, that this was in 18 or some -- we knew about it and I don't remember the year, it's too far back, but what have we done in the last four years? For five years what has been done? If this was all so sure in 18 something, well it certainly was in 1958, 1959. Something should have been done and nobody has said anything about the financing of this. Is Metro supposed to do it. Is Metro going to be left with all the cost? The Honourable Minister said, "As soon as I came in I knew we needed something like Metro." Is that why Metro was created, to push those things on Metro and say, "Okay, fight it out; swim or sink now." Is that it? It sure seems like it tonight. I sure -- (Interjection) -- What was that? Well at least we can't accuse the CCF or the NDPs of doing nothing because they've never been in power and I think we'd wait a long time, too long if we wait for them. But in the meantime I think that we should have assurance that something is being done and then we should definitely talk about the financing of this matter. I certainly agree with the Leader of the NDP that Ottawa should be contacted in this, and certainly the province, we're certainly not going to leave that in the hands of Metro to do and also to finance by itself. I think that that would be most unfair, and so far we haven't heard anything else. It's just been -- well we know it is this but Metro is there and, well, Metro will do it. I think that the Minister -- I can see -- I am sure that he's not as convinced, that he doesn't feel as strongly in this as he does about other of his projects, and it is difficult to convince the members of this Committee, but I think that he should tell us if he feels it is a responsibility of the government and maybe the responsibility of this government to try and get some commitments or some help from Ottawa and definitely if Metro is going to be charged with doing this work that at least financially and with advisors and so on that the provincial government will do something.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I merely want to say this. Now, whether or not this problem is the result of inaction in the past or not, the fact is it's with us today and we know that there is a sort of a dual responsibility here. One, Metro, and we know what Metro is going to do -- at least we know reasonably well what they're going to do. They're going to spend, I think it's 26 some odd million dollars in four or five phases in the next 20 years and in that way they're going to fulfill their obligations, but insofar as the provincial responsibility

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.) . . . . is concerned, that we do not know and that I suppose is the purpose of all this questioning on this topic, this problem here tonight. I suggested earlier that the Minister of Agriculture's statement last Fall left us somewhat confused, and after listening to the Leader of the Opposition cite quotations from the papers, I feel all the more that there is confusion here as to what the province is going to do. This is what we want to find out. Do they recognize any obligation on their part? Do they acknowledge that if Metro's expenditures are to have the optimum effect there must be some action by the province in order to provide an increased flow into the Red? What is the province going to do? And I invited the Minister to answer on that point. I can't say that I feel satisfied on that score. I invited the Minister of Agriculture to experience the effect of pollution personally by coming to a picnic lunch. I invite the Minister of Health to join him and myself some time this summer.

. . . . . Continued on next page.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, one thing that the speakers on the other side of the House have well established, and that was that the province was in a terrible mess when the Conservative Government took over. One might be tempted to say that the stench that some people are experiencing this past summer was a good reminder of how far the . . . . . had been established when this government took over, because all the speeches so far from the opposition have done is to indicate the extremity of the situation that must have existed in 1958, and there was absolutely no action nor any indication of action at that time. Not the slightest indication of any action.

Now the first thing that this government did, one of the first things that the government did was to establish Metro and, as I have said before in this House, we had to do it over the dead bodies of the Liberal group in the House. They weren't so sure that Metro was absolutely essential for Greater Winnipeg, but this government knew that there were certain problems that the complex of Metro faced and they had to be met, and only the co-ordinated ability and the co-ordinated efforts of a community under Metro could meet these problems and solve them. This was the first step and a most important step and, as I said, it was done over the dead bodies of the Liberal group. They say nothing has been done. There was real leadership given in this respect, and I suggest to you that if it hadn't been for such pressing and urgent problems as sewage and pollution of the rivers that maybe it wouldn't have been so essential to bring in Metro, but that's why Metro was brought in -- (Interjection) -- Oh yes it was -- to face these pressing issues of the day that had gone too long and too far. They say that there is no help -- there's no help from Ottawa. Well I'm just speaking off the top of my head. I haven't had an opportunity to check on this, but it seems to me that under CMHC there is pretty large or substantial financing available for sewage disposal purposes -- (Interjection) -- Oh yes. Oh yes. As I recall, I think that CMHC will finance some thing like 65% of sewage disposal projects. Now I stand to be corrected, but only upon concrete evidence that this is otherwise.

Now another thing that the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the NDP did for me tonight was to make me think that Dr. Hochbaum might not have been as wrong as I thought he was, or maybe his anxieties over the use of water in Manitoba were not as exaggerated as I might have thought they were. When the two leaders of the two opposition groups in this House got up and, without too much care, seemed to indicate or appeared to try to infer that the Minister of Agriculture and the government were being very slow in utilizing the available waters in the province to solve this river pollution problem, maybe he wasn't so wrong in his anxiety. Maybe there is a danger, as he said, that there might be an attempt made to use Lake Manitoba to flush the sewage for Winnipeg. He put it a little bit stronger. I would like to explain to the House that although there is relief to this matter of pollution through the development of our water resources, this government, under the laws of this province, nor any other government has any right to commit the waters of this province to the purpose of solving our river pollution problem. There are many uses of water and there are priorities of the use of water, and river pollution is not a top ranking priority. This does not mean, however, that in the development of our water resource that Greater Winnipeg will not benefit through former flows in the Assiniboine and Red River, but it does mean that you cannot commit, for this specific purpose, the waters that you develop on our water resource. It means that when we build the Shellmouth Reservoir and we have a minimum flow of 450 cubic feet per second, it means that in the initial stage on the Assiniboine, before the uses of irrigation, industrial uses and municipal water uses have built up over the years to the point where they require a major part of this flow. It means that there will be relief for a situation such as existed this past summer on the Red and Assiniboine through Greater Winnipeg.

You know I am very much amused by the interpretation of history that the Leader of the Opposition has indulged in tonight, because I think about 1958, the summer or spring thereof, Lake Manitoba appeared in Manitoba, and above that, Lake Winnipegosis. The Assiniboine River all of a sudden became a reality. I didn't know that the people of Manitoba had been so fortunate with the emergence of a Conservative Government as to have inherited these resources as of the summer of 1958. They were there a long time ago. The problem existed a long time ago, and if this solution is so good today it must have been good prior to 1958. I don't deny for a moment, Mr. Chairman, in fact I feel that there is a great potential in our water resource

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) . . . . in this province, a great potential that is not being used at the present time. I am one of those who believe that all the interests of the people can be served a great deal better than they are at the present time, without harm or prejudice to any group, by a better utilization through the development of this great water resource that we have. I know that in this complex of lakes that we have, these inland lakes, in particular Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipegosis, there is a great potential for water to serve South Central Manitoba, including the Greater Winnipeg complex.

Certainly nothing was done and nothing was even heard in the past until this government took over, but we are talking about big things -- big programs. Oh, we're not doing so little -- we're not doing so little. We've just got a program under way that is the greatest thing in water development that's ever hit this province. It just dwarfs anything that was ever done before. -- (Interjection) -- You can't wait -- you can't wait. What about the Shellmouth Reservoir? What about the Portage Diversion? The Honourable Leader of the Opposition takes great issue with me because I'm quoted as saying a canal out of Lake Manitoba is sure in the future, but it won't happen before 1967. Well that's a pretty sensible statement, Mr. Chairman, because you don't want to start taking water out of a lake until you've got ways and means of getting water into the lake.

I am going to talk about this subject at greater length on a different occasion, but just to explain some of the quotes that were lifted out of context here tonight in respect of my stand on this matter, I still say here or anywhere else, that Lake Manitoba, and Lake Winnipegosis too, will be an integral part of our water supply in south central Manitoba in the future. You don't develop these things just like that overnight. If my honourable friends didn't think of it in 20 years, can we be faulted if we can't have the thing ready on the first case of emergency?

We expected a flood on the Assiniboine in the spring of 1960. We experienced flooding and paid out substantial damages for flooding on the Red in the spring of '60. In the spring and summer of '61 we had some of the lowest flows in history on the Red and the Assiniboine, because my honourable friends on the other side waited for it to rain before they patched the roof. Yes. Now they fault us because we haven't even had time to get up on the roof -- (Interjection) -- Yes -- four years -- and what have we done in that time? This year we are going to start excavation on the Greater Winnipeg Floodway. This year we are starting our preliminary work on the two other big projects -- nothing like it in the history of this province -- to help solve this problem. We have been doing a great deal with investigation work on these water resources that we have and as they relate to the problem that we're discussing here tonight. Yes, we're good investigators. And in the interest of the province, it's a good thing we are, because there are more interests than one in our water resource.

There may be some people in this province who think I am a bit of a dog on this question, who think that maybe I'm one of those who would just love to put all the water resources through Greater Winnipeg, and there are those in this House who would like them to think so. But they have proven tonight, I think, that in their anxiety over this question they aren't going to do too much thinking or investigation into the over-all needs and requirements for water in this province and a sensible allocation of these waters to the various interests in this province, because we have agriculture that needs water in the future; we've got wild-life that needs water in the future; we've got industrial water uses; we've got domestic water uses; and they all have to be looked after. It takes a lot of investigation and it takes a lot of planning if you're going to have a program that is going to serve the needs of the people in this province in the future. You just don't do it overnight. We've gone a long way in the short time that we have been in office. We're just on the verge of getting this whole thing moving -- the actual construction going on it. It may seem long to my friends over there, but it isn't nearly as long as the people have waited in the past.

I'd like to raise another question here. When you say that the Province of Manitoba -- I don't know how far you're talking about going in contributing to this problem of sewage disposal and river pollution in Greater Winnipeg. What about the City of Portage la Prairie? What about the City of Brandon? What about all the other towns and cities throughout Manitoba who have to work out their own salvation in this respect? -- (Interjection) -- I am suggesting that Metro Winnipeg, with 65% of the real property value in the Province of Manitoba, is just as much capable of looking after their sewage disposal problem as the little town is who has



(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) . . . . to provide their needs. The Town of Portage, the City of Portage, the City of Brandon, all the other towns through the Province of Manitoba, do you think relatively speaking it isn't just as great a responsibility and a burden to these people to solve their problems as it is for Greater Winnipeg? -- (Interjection) -- Maybe I am, but there are other people too. There are other people too, and when we consider the water resources of this province you have to consider everybody. You have to consider everybody.

Now our policy is this. First of all, in facing this problem, Mr. Chairman, and I'm speaking directly to the Leader of the Opposition, we brought in Metro. He wasn't very helpful, but we got it, and now we have a body -- (Interjection) -- No, we're not blaming Metro at all. Mr. Chairman, we have Metro. Metro has set itself to the task in respect of those matters which are within their powers and jurisdiction to carry out. We know also that the matter of flow in the river is extremely important and complementary to the success of their efforts to solve the sewage disposal problem within its boundaries. We have undertaken major measures -- multi-million dollar measures -- to make sure that in the future the rivers and streams in Manitoba are not permitted to waste their waters as they have in the past. -- (Interjection) -- Well, the Assiniboine River and the Red River are two important rivers in the Province of Manitoba and they are getting attention. The Pembina River is another one that's getting attention, not to say anything of the myriad of streams that are getting close attention in this province as they never have before. Oh, it's a big program, and when I get talking to the House on this program it's going to take me sometime to cover the comprehensive program that we have, and I don't intend to do it tonight. But in respect of this problem that you have raised, the criticism that you have directed against this government for inactivity can only be camouflage to cover your own inadequacies in the past.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, if I may. What a very interesting discourse from the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Chairman. Most interesting, but still no policy except for one thing. He did tell us one thing. The Roblin Government set up Metro so they could pass the buck to it. This was one clear statement of policy that he enunciated. Yes, now they can cross off all the problems about river pollution on Metro's back. This was the basic element in my honourable friend's statement and, by the way, this was exactly what the Minister of Health said too, because when he spoke about the specific items that were being done, he mentioned those that were being done by Metro when he spoke about developments at the Kildonan plant and lagoons in the southern part of the city. This is nothing to do with the provincial government. These are developments of the Metro Corporation. What we're interested in knowing is what does the provincial government intend to do about the water flows on the rivers here in Winnipeg?

The reason that I quoted from the newspaper articles the way I did is that the statements of the Minister of Agriculture today are completely unclear in this regard. Does he intend to build the diversion or not? No one knows. He's trying to say that I said earlier that it should be built. I don't know if it should be built. I'm asking him what his policy is, and I still haven't found out from him. He says that Dr. Hochbaum should be worried. Well I'll say this much, as long as my honourable friend is as unclear about his intentions, Dr. Hochbaum can relax because it's obvious that my friend still hasn't made up his mind what he's going to do. What this House wants to know is what are the intentions of this government in this regard?

He talks about the past. Every time he has no answer, Mr. Chairman, he goes back and talks about pre 1958 days. This is the whole reply of this government across the way. Well look, let's come up to 1962. Those are the problems that we are here discussing at the moment. We're discussing your estimates; what this government is doing; or what it plans to do. What we intend to do is to find out from you what your policies are. I will say this much, that so far we're finding out that in many of these fields where my honourable friends go bragging around the province, they have in fact no policy -- a lot of talk but no policy. Now tell us exactly what your policy is in the matter of having greater water flows on the rivers through Winnipeg. That's the question -- answer it. Quit beating around the bush. Quit telling us about pre 1958 and the troubles back in the incorporation days of Winnipeg.

As far as the Minister of Health and his hidden reports, well now that's quite a story he had to tell us here tonight. Hidden reports he said. I'll have him know when the House opened this evening I sent a note to the library asking for a report that my honourable friend published

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . . some time last summer, and my note said: "Have you a copy of the water pollution report on the Red River, published in 1961 by the Manitoba Government?" Mr. Chairman, what was I replied: "I'm sorry, we haven't a copy. We are getting some tomorrow." He talks about a hidden report back in 1952. I don't know what he's talking about, but insofar as his report, it's obviously not even available in the library here. Mr. Chairman, the whole question is: what does this government propose to do? Does the government intend to build a diversion or does it not? The Minister didn't answer that question in the least. He spoke at great length about his great plans for water conservation in the province and we're certainly for it, but this is a question of river pollution that we're discussing at the moment. What are his intentions in that regard?

Mr. Chairman, last summer, or last fall, when the report was published on the Shellmouth, the Holland and the Portage diversion, I quoted parts of the report. There was a further part. This is November 30th, Winnipeg Free Press: "Metro Winnipeg officials are to meet Premier Duff Roblin Friday afternoon to ask the province to construct the channels." I could only assume that they met. I don't know what happened. At a later date, this is December 29th, the Minister of Agriculture says: "Mr. Hutton said that so far he has never been asked to investigate the policy of the canal." Well I don't know what the First Minister and my honourable friend do in the same Cabinet, but they obviously don't communicate. On the 30th of November the Premier is going to be met by Metro officials to ask for it; at the end of December the Minister of Agriculture, who is responsible, apparently hasn't heard about it yet. That, Mr. Chairman, is the whole problem in this thing. This government has no policy and the Minister still hasn't told us what he intends to do.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, I listened to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface suggest that since he wasn't here before 1958 he wasn't too concerned with past history, and I suppose he feels no responsibility for what happened. Well, Mr. Speaker, people here have to take some responsibility for the past actions or inaction of the parties which they represent. I want to say that as I listened to the Minister of Health and the Minister of Agriculture tonight, if I closed my eyes it reminded me of the experiences I had before 1958, when as a municipal representative from Winnipeg I used to hear the same kind of arguments from the people who are now sitting here who were then sitting there. Because what were they saying? "It's up to the people of Greater Winnipeg to solve their own problems." Exactly the words which the Minister of Agriculture used tonight. "You've got 65% of the assessed value of the province in the Greater Winnipeg area so you'll have to look after it yourself." Well, I wish he'd look at what happened to that former government. They now have one seat out of 20 in Greater Winnipeg, precisely because they took the attitude which you take tonight, and I want to predict if you continue with your attitude you will have the same fate in the next election. The people of Winnipeg are not going to accept the fact that all they get from the provincial government, any provincial government, is a lot of advice. Talk is cheap and tonight that's all we're getting from that side of the House.

Now I want to say just one thing. The Minister has a very cute way of talking on both sides of every question -- the same speech -- not even on different nights. As the Leader of the Opposition said, the Minister closed by saying that he thought if we used common sense there was enough water in this province for all the uses of the province, but if he goes back about ten minutes in his speech, and I'm sure we can check it in the Hansard when it comes out, he will find that he was suggesting that there are some people who think that all the water should be used for the use of Greater Winnipeg Sewage disposal. Well the only person who suggested that is the Honourable Minister. Nobody else suggested that. I think we all agree that there is enough water, not tomorrow or next year, but given the use of the plans which have been devised, or will be devised, there is enough water for everybody. But we in the Greater Winnipeg area are concerned that if the plans which have been devised, or will be devised in detail for sewage disposal in the Greater Winnipeg are to work, that we must be guaranteed a sufficient flow of water so that these plans, these systems can work. I still have to hear a very definite commitment from the Minister that this will be done. Not tomorrow, not next year, maybe not before 1967, but even then the Minister has so many qualifications, so many commitments in his speech that I, for one, cannot feel certain that the Greater Winnipeg area will be assured of sufficient water in the rivers to handle the sewage disposal properly.

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) . . . . .

Now I want to say one more thing. Both Ministers spoke very lengthily about the plans of the government, and of the projects of the government. I want to say that as far as I was concerned it sounded mostly like good advice to the citizens of Metropolitan Winnipeg as to how they should spend a tremendous amount of money. I think that the figure, the figure that I remember, that it will cost somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$35 million in order to establish the sewage disposal system in Metropolitan Winnipeg which is required. Now I want to say -- maybe we always get in this trouble when the First Minister is away -- I doubt if the First Minister would go as far as it seems to me that both the Minister of Health and the Minister of Agriculture did by indirect methods, and I think the Minister of Agriculture almost said directly that the entire cost of establishing and operating a sewage disposal system in Greater Winnipeg -- well the Minister shakes his head -- but I think that that's the only inference one can take from his speech, is that the citizens of Metropolitan Winnipeg are going to have to go it themselves. I want to say to the Minister that he should give some very serious thought to this suggestion, because if I know the people of Greater Winnipeg, they are not going to be happy with this if this is the government's policy. If the Minister wants to suggest that to compare -- first of all it's not fair, it's incorrect to say that the citizens of all the other towns and cities of Manitoba have to look after the problem themselves. That is not true because when we get to one of the Ministers, maybe the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Public Works, we will be told that there is money as there always has been, and I suppose we'll be told that there's more money now than there ever was to help the municipalities to help the cities and towns establish sewer and water program.

But I want to say this, Mr. Chairman, we in Greater Winnipeg certainly are not asking for any special consideration, but to suggest that it's easy for the people of Greater Winnipeg to finance a \$35 million program for one phase of its life, for one phase of the activities of Greater Winnipeg, to suggest that it's easy to find \$35 million, even spread over the next 15 or 20 years, is nonsense. Yet that is essentially what the Minister of Agriculture was telling this House and I presume telling the people of Greater Winnipeg. I want to say this, Mr. Chairman, that that is not good enough for the people of Greater Winnipeg and that they will not take this kind of talk, this kind of lecture by the Minister of Agriculture, but we in this House have to sit and listen to it. The people of Greater Winnipeg have a better method of handling it. They will handle it, if that's the answer of the Minister and the answer of the government, they will handle it at the next election.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): . . . . . Mr. Chairman, at this point -- I led off here. First of all with respect to the report that was not in the Library tonight, I guess I have to take some blame that it isn't there. I notice the Member from Selkirk had a copy tonight and this report was . . . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Yes, my own copy, Mr. Chairman, and he has it with him. That's the reason I tried to get one from the Library.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Well, that's too bad. We'll have to provide the honourable member with one. This was released and reported on quite extensively last summer.

The thing that I think we have to realize -- and I was quite surprised at the accusations of the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party -- as he recalls as a member of the Greater Winnipeg Sanitary District, if you look over the annual reports over the years, the Sanitary Commission when I came to office advised me that we could never really get an over-all plan at the provincial level from the district because of the split jurisdiction, and that until the boundaries were very definitely settled and the district was able to absorb all these boundaries, it made over-all planning for the future very difficult. There were no plans, but long term plans in the possession of this Sanitary Commission two years ago, and I discussed this matter with the Greater Winnipeg Sanitary district. When Metro came into being, just before the Greater Winnipeg Sanitary district went out of operation and Metro came in, this over-all plan was called for and this over-all plan is the plan submitted by McLaren and by the two consultant groups -- Underwood and McLellan and the McLaren group from . . . . . Now when this report was received, as I indicated, it was an extensive report and it gave alternative methods of tackling the over-all situation -- (Interjection) -- Well this consultant's report was just filed last summer, I guess it was, and we studied it -- this report. We had preliminary

(Mr. Johnson (Gimli), cont'd.) . . . . meetings with Metro, their Sanitary Commission did, and finally we felt that there had to be one planning authority in the Metro area as far as the commission was concerned. We wanted to be brought into things and how things were going to be to clear our areas of responsibility. One has to give the Metro authorities a fair amount of freedom in planning in order to effect proper economies and to prevent — we got to get on with the job instead of more and more studies as the honourable member suggests. It was also brought to light that under that, I think it's C-42 Bill, CMHC offers a loan of up to 2% -- of two-thirds of the cost of constructing sewage treatment facilities which will reduce pollution; and if completed within a certain time limit, a reimbursement of 25% is made -- 25% of the two-thirds — and they certainly expect some saving.

Now I think Metro have announced that they hope to implement the total recommendation over a ten-year period, with the first two projects, the first phase of their program being completed in '66. In allowing over-all planning to the Metro authorities, the Sanitary Commission's concern has been the method by which any new outfalls into the river may be handled in the interim period. We feel this must be the responsibility of Metro. In other words, to give them the over-all jurisdiction and, at the same time, it has been suggested that our officials serve in a continuing advisory capacity. I think these are the facts of the matter. I think it was the lack of over-all planning in the past which prevented a start on a program. Certainly I had never seen a plan until this one was presented.

I think that the Minister of Agriculture was trying to say that the Shellmouth proposition has been approved, but in dealing with the river flow through the Greater Winnipeg area, I have to accept Agriculture and Conservation's statement that the amount of water available is predicated upon the agricultural and other irrigation and conservation uses to which the water may be put, and I think this was explained to the authorities. I think a lot of smog is brought into a discussion of this nature and I am not trying to plead for sweet reasonableness. I think the province, through our Sanitary Control Commission, do have an over-all pretty good idea of the health implications and we accept responsibility in this area. I would hope that as Metro, I believe they now take their total program to the Municipal Board, I haven't followed it in the last few days or week or so, but we would hope to work very closely with them. These are some of the facts of the matter. As we said, it is a \$31 million ten-year program with the first stage to be completed in '66 and the whole thing over this period. I think that if the substantial savings, we hope -- this is without the benefit of any CMHC reimbursement which Metro may be able to achieve, which I understood would -- I just forget the percentage they would hope to be reimbursed over the long run. I think this is really all that one can say at this point. I don't think there is any attempt to deliberately mislead the committee, and I do agree that there's no use going too far into the past. I do think it is a step forward to have over-all planning in this area and I think an agency, such as the formation of Metro, involving all the involved municipalities, is the wise way to approach it. I think the Leader of the NDP, having served on the Sanitary District, would agree with the one jurisdiction and planning agency for this area. I think that as the province and the agricultural program goes forward, that additional waters will be of tremendous value in this area.

Now there are technical opinions which don't all entirely agree with the measures that possibly the consultants have given, but a great deal of advice has been sought by ourselves and I know by the Metro authorities, and I think it is something that has to be kept under yearly review in view of changing conditions and certainly we had hoped to work with them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Agriculture.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition endeavoured with some vehemence to establish that we're doing absolutely nothing. The Honourable Member for St. John's endeavoured to establish that the Minister of Agriculture is opposed to Greater Winnipeg. They didn't have too much argument to substantiate the charges, but, nevertheless, I don't think that I should sit here and let such charges stand.

In the first place, Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition said: "What have you done?" There was a phrase, a little saying going around Canada some time ago, "What's a million?" And now we have the Liberal Leader in the Province of Manitoba who says: "What's 20 million? What's 20 million?" Well, the Shellmouth reservoir and the Portage diversion will cost about that and these projects are under way. Well what's 20 million? This is nothing.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, will the Minister permit a question?

MR. HUTTON: No, not at the present time. What's 20 million? This is nothing. He knows very well, Mr. Chairman, that these two major projects are a major step forward in the development of a water resource which is going to solve this problem that we've been talking about here tonight. There is no inconsistency with the stand that I have taken on the question of this canal out of Lake Manitoba into the Assiniboine. Unfortunately, I am a Minister charged with the responsibility of a resource that, even in respect of the people who live in Greater Winnipeg, represents many things. Certainly it is a part of the solution to their pollution problem, but the water resource to this province represents recreation to them in all its aspects and we have to see that these interests are correlated.

I was glad for the understanding that the member for St. John brought to this argument here. He at least appreciates that we have to co-ordinate all these different interests. He at least appreciates, Mr. Chairman, as the Leader of the Opposition cannot, that you can't do these things overnight. He does give credit to the fact that you have to plan and that it takes some time. He said that he wasn't so concerned that they weren't here today or tomorrow, but he wanted to make sure that in the development of this resource that he would take into consideration the needs of Greater Winnipeg in respect of this problem of pollution. This is exactly what we are doing.

Those who would try to establish that we have no program and that the Minister of Agriculture is inconsistent in his stand on the matter of a channel or canal out of Lake Manitoba, fail to take into consideration the fact that, to be really effective, you've got to have some way of getting water into Lake Manitoba. I frankly would be very dubious about putting another outlet into Lake Manitoba without first having another means of firming up the levels in that lake. Now I know that there's a lot of water going down the Fairford Channel that might just as well be coming through the City of Winnipeg. I grant that, that there's a lot of water goes down the Fairford Channel that might just as well be coming through on the Assiniboine, but when you come upon seasons and periods when your waters drop low, this is the time when you need the water most; and you've got to have some way of firming up those levels in that lake before you put in another canal. This doesn't mean there's any inconsistency in the stand of the government or myself. It just means you've got to plan; you've got to act well in advance. This is the stand that I have taken and this is what I've said. I am quite sure that in the future such a canal will be built. I'm quite sure that in the future Winnipegosis and Lake Manitoba will be harnessed. I'm quite sure that in the future there will be waters for Greater Winnipeg.

I can also say that under the statutes of this province that you cannot commit waters for this particular use. They are a by-product, if you can understand that. They are a by-product, these benefits of river pollution -- water for river pollution purposes for your over-all development. This doesn't mean to say, however, that Greater Winnipeg will not benefit, as surely they will. The Honourable Member for St. John's tried very hard to get me on the opposite side of the fence from Greater Winnipeg. What I said holds true. Greater Winnipeg is responsible. Metro Winnipeg is responsible, just as any other centre is responsible. The honourable member himself said that there is financing and assistance for rural communities: I pointed out in my earlier remarks that there is financing available, both federally as well as the interest and assistance that the Province of Manitoba would take in this, but this doesn't mean that Metro isn't responsible, as any other centre, and it doesn't put me on the opposite side as my honourable friend from St. John's would like to.

It may be true that in a period such as we've gone through that people become anxious over a problem, and nobody can blame them. I wouldn't suggest that I would enjoy a picnic with the Honourable Member from Brokenhead under such circumstances as he has outlined. At the same time, this doesn't mean that we are not doing anything and that we're not interested. It doesn't take away at all from the arguments that I put forward, that the first step in this matter was to get the activities and the financial resources of the 19 municipalities affected co-ordinated behind this program. It doesn't take away anything from the fact that this province in the development of its water resources, even though it may seem slow in coming at a time like this, it doesn't take away from the fact that we have an earnest and a sincere interest in this and that we do intend to see that provision is made for an improvement in the water supply in the river in the future.

March 19th, 1962

MR. MOLGAT: The Minister of Agriculture is very adept at trying to put words in people's mouths. I don't recall having said anything about \$20 million -- not in the least.

MR. HUTTON: No, you just said nothing is being done.

MR. MOLGAT: I want to find out from you what's being done. My question to you is, what is your policy? Now the Shellmouth Dam -- from the very words of the Minister himself, will not provide water for the purposes of river pollution in Winnipeg, and he indicated that a large part of that water will be used for other purposes --(interjection)-- All right. He indicated priorities of another type. If he could indicate to us the net increase in water flows in Winnipeg, then we'll be able to judge the effect of this as a river pollution measure. On the basis of his past statements, one can only assume that it has only very small benefits from a river pollution standpoint. The second step that he mentioned, the Portage Diversion by itself will have absolutely no effect on river pollution in this metropolitan area -- none whatever in fact. If it has an effect by itself it will be the reverse, because it will be taking water from the Assiniboine River and putting it into Lake Manitoba. Then we come along to the third step, Mr. Chairman, and this is what I am trying to find out from the Minister. What exactly is this government's position with regard to the diversion back from Lake Manitoba into the Assiniboine River? Does it propose to build it or does it not propose to build it? If it proposes to build it, when does it intend to do so? That's the question that I am asking the Minister and that's the policy that I would like enunciated at this time, because the remainder of what he talks about does not solve the problem of river pollution in this area.

Now I said to the Minister; I quoted to him the statements that had been made in the newspapers that Metro Winnipeg officials were going to meet the Premier to discuss this matter. Now I would like to know did the meeting take place, and what was the result of the discussion? Could the Minister enlighten us on that? Could he tell us what his policy is?

MR. HUTTON: I would like to answer the last question first, Mr. Chairman. Metro never mentioned it to the Premier on that occasion -- the occasion that your honourable leader is referring to. I'd like to just -- on this question of Shellmouth water insofar as Winnipeg is concerned. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition should know, as I am sure he does, that at the instance that this reservoir comes into operation, requirements of the uses on the Assiniboine are going to be just about what they were the year before and that only over a period of years will the uses of water accumulate or build up for the water that will be available out of the Shellmouth Reservoir. In the initial stage, before you have developed a demand for this water in the upstream area, there will be a very substantial increase in the flows of the Assiniboine during dry periods, even down this far. Last summer the flow at Headingly was about 92 cubic feet per second. The flow at Brandon was about 7 or 8 cubic feet per second. The flows on the Assiniboine, the minimum flows on the Assiniboine after the Shellmouth Reservoir is constructed, will be in the neighbourhood of 450 cubic feet per second, which would be of great benefit to the City of Winnipeg in the initial stages. What we are saying is that you cannot commit the waters of this reservoir to only the problem of solving river pollution. This does not mean that just because you cannot commit it for that purpose, that in the first decade or so, there will be a substantial improvement in the situation, especially on the Assiniboine.

Now the other thing the Honourable Leader of the Opposition says is that the building of the Portage Diversion has no bearing on this problem. I tried at some length to tell him that it was a prerequisite to developing Lake Manitoba as a source of water for the lower Assiniboine River. I don't know what more I can say. You've got to have the Portage Diversion before you can use Lake Manitoba water consistently and with any dependence. I expect that it will be about 1967 before the Portage Diversion will be completed, and I have said that I doubt very much if a canal out of Lake Manitoba would be undertaken before that time. Now you can take out of that what you like, but the Portage Diversion is a step that must be taken in this plan. I am very happy that the Honourable Member for St. John's at least appreciates the need for planning and appreciates that, even though we can't alleviate the situation immediately, that we are taking steps that will eventually solve or help to solve this problem. I can't say more, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, .....

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have been trying to get in here for quite a little while, and the reason that I want to get into this debate is because I think that we are losing sight of the

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd) . . . . . problem that we have before us in the Greater Winnipeg area; namely, the problem of pollution here. Now it's all very well for us to paddle up the various rivers and streams in the Province of Manitoba; to go up and down Portage Diversion and Shellmouth Dam; but the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, I think we should go back to what was the original purpose of the Greater Winnipeg Sanitary District. It was not a question of putting more water into the Red River way and the Assiniboine way, but to take the pollution out of the river. That was the objective back in 1930 when the sanitary plan at Kildonan was built. What if we do, as the Minister of Agriculture has suggested, simply bring more water into the Red River in the year 1962. He says that it is not possible at this time, and in that I believe that he is correct. He says that it will take at least until 1967 before we will have any larger amount of water in the rivers running through the Greater Winnipeg area. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the discussion this evening has been dealing with the wrong angle, because if we're going to have a greater flow by 1967 the population possibly of the Greater Winnipeg area will have increased by another 15 or 20% at least, and the whole problem will be aggravated and then we'll have to find water from somewhere else. To me the problem is the question of taking the pollution out of the rivers, and despite the low flow of the Assiniboine and of the Red River in recent years, it hasn't actually been the trouble, the lack of flow, but the amount of pollution that has to be entered into the rivers.

Now my honourable friend the Minister of Health a few moments ago mentioned that this had to be brought into Metro in order that one large area of administration could take care of this. He mentioned the report that just came in rather recently dealing with this problem on a Metro basis. I agree with him to some degree, but this problem was a problem that the sanitary district had ten years ago. Most of the municipalities in the Greater Winnipeg area were members of the Greater Winnipeg Sanitary District. If I recall correctly the largest municipality that was not part of the Greater Winnipeg Sanitary District was the now City of St. James, and that caused a lot of the trouble. An investigation was made in the report that I referred to, to see how in those days, ten years ago, those municipalities that weren't part and parcel of the Greater Winnipeg Sanitary District could be made members. So as far as Metro itself is concerned, the advent of Metro has no bearing at all on the problem that we've got, because we had this problem long before Metro was seriously considered -- (interjection)-- Yes, and practically the same people, except that they have a few more municipalities now that weren't in the Sanitary District.

Now the problem then, as the problem now, is not necessarily bringing more water in. True, it will help -- but it will not solve the problem. What I want to hear from the government is not their plan for five or ten years from now of diverting streams and waterways into the Greater Winnipeg area. What additional provisions are they going to make to assist Metro in expanding of the facilities that are here at the present time for the treatment of sewage, other than simply flushing it down a river? I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the idea of using rivers simply as open sewers for the disposal of sanitation went out fifty or seventy-five years ago. That is the problem of the Greater Winnipeg area -- not more water, but taking the pollution out. When the plant, as I understand it when reading the history of the setting up of the sanitary district here, as I mentioned back in 1930, the capacity it was hoped at that time would be of sufficient size to make sure that none of the sewage matters were deposited in the Red River. You well remember, I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, that Main Street was dug up all the way from the Canadian National Railways or somewhere adjacent to that, right down to Kildonan to take care of this. Interceptors were built. We in the town of Transcona made our contribution to a tunnel underneath the Red River into this giant interceptor on Main Street, in order that the pollution did not go into the river. With the expansion of the Greater Winnipeg area, this is no longer large enough to take care of the situation. I repeat again, and I think that I am correct in this, Mr. Chairman, when I say that the solution is not simply bringing more water in to aid in the situation that we have at the same time. But I'd like to hear from the government -- what are their plans insofar as the problem of making available in the area more chemical treatment plants so that after the water has gone through these plants that it can enter the river unpolluted?

The Honourable the Minister of Health mentioned something about, and I believe also the Minister of Agriculture, mentioned something under CMHC a 65% contribution for sanitary disposal fields -- or I hope that's what it is -- because it's my understanding that it's mainly dealing

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd) . . . . with the installation of sewage lines and the likes of that. But I would suggest this, Mr. Chairman, that if CMHC will make contribution of 65% of the cost loan, at what rate of interest. These are very, very vital. If this can be done on this basis, then that is the angle I think that the problem, and I'm not alone in this, has to be tackled. We can't wait until the Minister of Agriculture has built his diversions in the year 1967. A start should be made now, and to me again the base has taken on an aspect of the fact that we want water from here and hither yon in order to solve our problem. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that that won't solve our problem at all. It's taking the pollution out of the river as it is at the present time. That was the original idea of the Greater Winnipeg Sanitary District when it was first built in 1930.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): But the district never did have an over-all plan for the Greater Winnipeg area, and I do think that when they finally called these two groups together to carry out this plan we end up as I see in this debate with two problems. We need more water and we need more treatment. Metro is going ahead with the treatment -- the beginnings of the over-all treatment program. My impression from reading that report is, and it's one of the reasons we've had this continuing study and involving the Department of Agriculture and Conservation, is simply this, that as I understood the report, even when with all the optimum treatment finally in operation, for maximum efficiency of the treatment plan you do need, preferably more water coming through the area. Of course we've said again this is predicated on long range planning; it's predicated on how much of that water would actually come through. I don't think we can say at this particular time how much water would come through by the development of the works as planned by the department. This is a matter that has to be kept under continuous review. But I think we have to agree that a start has been made; an over-all plan has been formulated; positive steps have been taken to get on with this job; and I think we can be grateful for that. I do agree that both the Sanitary Control Commission in an over-all capacity has to continue to examine newer methods of treatment, because changing conditions and new research may bring to light new procedures. But we can't wait; we have to get on with the job. I think it's a matter of more water and more treatment.

MR. MOLGAT: Before the Minister of Agriculture leaves the House, I hope that he will inform us what his decisions are with regard to the diversion from Lake Manitoba into the Assiniboine. This is vital to the discussion that we're having and I would certainly like to have that answer before he departs.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I'm not ready to pass it yet. My interests are not confined to just the Red River and that part which passes through the City of Winnipeg. Certainly if it's within the jurisdiction and power of the government, they can do something about it. I don't see why it's necessary to have solids and sewage drained into the Red River. After all, the city has a system and let them operate it.

A MEMBER: It can't handle it.

MR. FROESE: Then just enlarge it. My interest goes further and I would like the Minister to tell us something about the lagoons that have been brought into operation throughout the province. A few years ago I had a chance to go down south into the United States and saw some of their lagoons in operation there. I noticed that most of them that I saw were much larger than the ones that we have in Manitoba, and I'm wondering whether we're setting the same requirements that the people down south do as to size for the population that is being served by these lagoons. Also, I understand that lagoons generally have to be flushed before winter sets in, and in a number of cases what happens is that they're just drained into the creeks and streams. Now I think that adds to the pollution, so that the Red River might be polluted by the time it gets to Winnipeg after all.

And talk about the stench. I think some of the lagoons that we have in the rural parts are much worse than the Red River is in the City of Winnipeg and this I think, is because of the smallness of these lagoons. I think they should be much larger in proportion to the people that they service. What kind of control is being exercised over these lagoons? And I would like to know how many new ones were constructed last year? How is industrial waste affecting the problem of pollution in the rural parts? Then, I don't know whether this has too much bearing on this matter at the present time but last summer there were a lot of wells drilled in the Winkler area to make tests as to the supply of water in that area and I would like to know whether tests were



(Mr. Froese, cont'd) . . . . . made of those samples that were taken; whether there was any pollution in those samples.

MR. PREFONTAINE: I am sorry that the Minister of Agriculture has left the House, but I would like to ask the Minister of Health maybe to pass on to him the question that I might ask at the present time.

The Minister of Agriculture told us that he was building the Winnipeg floodway and that excavation would be started in the spring. I wonder what this has to do with the pollution; how it will prevent pollution? But at least he chided us with respect to the fact that we don't seem to be concerned with the sums of money that he is spending. He mentioned somebody stating that's a million? And he asked us what \$16 million that I am spending for the -- I thought he mentioned the Russell Reservoir or Shellmouth Reservoir and Assiniboine diversion. I for one, I am concerned about this money and I am concerned about the sum of \$200 million possibly that will be spent for this floodway which to my mind will not do anything at all in order to flush the Red River or to help in the pollution problem around Winnipeg.

I have with me here the report of the Red River Investigation problem, special investigation in it. It states here something that is very, very interesting; after it has a main headline: "Storage in Relation to the Flood Hazard in Greater Winnipeg," it goes on to state a principle: "Control by an adequate system of detention reservoir provides the most widespread benefits of any method of flood protection". Now, Mr. Chairman, the whole book concerns the protection, conservation of water and says that it is possible to do two things at the same time to help against the flood; protecting the people against the flood; and at the same time to conserve water for different use. And it says that it would be possible to build dams on the tributaries and the Mining Commission has recommended, and I might quote here, the Commission recommends, that's on page 2, "That a detailed engineering study of the potentialities of the Pembina Dam be undertaken by a competent authority". I will not read it all but that's plain enough to let everyone understand that they want some more studies with respect to the Pembina Dam. They go on to say, "that detailed engineering studies be commenced immediately in the Upper Red River Valley to determine the effectiveness and benefits from Flood control and water supply all (I) all reservoirs on the tributaries." Now, Mr. Speaker, these have not been done and it might be possible to do two things at the same time, to preserve water for industrial and agricultural uses and at the same time to afford quite a bit of protection to Greater Winnipeg against flooding.

Now on the east side very close to the Red River there are streams, rivers where it would be possible to build dams, to empty them at the end of the winter or late fall and then to fill them in the spring and let the water go slowly later on. The benefits might be greater than has been estimated because there hasn't been a thorough study. There is the Joubert Creek on the east side of the river that runs out just about some 20 miles of the Red River and there's a wide large basin. Now this stream takes a lot of this river, takes a lot of water to the Red River in the spring, a great deal, it floods all along the way. The people at Grunthal have been asking for a dam for a long time. If a dam was built there it could store a lot of water and later on this water could be let come through Winnipeg and help in the pollution to a certain extent. There's the Red River, there's a dam that has been built in '58 and '59. It could be elevated by some two feet quite easily. It wouldn't cost very much and the area covered would be much greater than now and this dam could be used also as protection against flood and at the same time to conserve the water which it seems, with the experience of 1961, that we will need very much in this province. There's a possibility of a dam on the Roseau River and that should be investigated. I believe these matters should have priority right now as against possibly excavation work in the spring. There's a possibility of the Marais River being looked into on the east and the west side; the Plum River on the west side; of course the Pembina Dam also and maybe in the upper regions of the Morris River. These things should be all investigated and that's very important, Mr. Speaker, because appendix F of the Red River Basin Investigation talks about this all along and says that by doing these works we could do something worthwhile.

Now I would like to recommend to the Minister that these projects should be looked into now, not later, not after we have spent \$200 million, but now, and the money spent on putting dams on these tributaries as recommended might help a lot in affording flood protection. This report states that between 1960 and 1963 some eight dams have been built in the United States. Smaller dams, but there are some eight more that should be investigated and looked into. Now,

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd) . . . . it should have been worthwhile certainly for the government to have got in touch with the United States and seen all the possibilities of conserving water early in the spring and letting the water coming down later in the year to have water pollution in Greater Winnipeg. Great possibilities, and I believe that we are becoming more and more conservationists in Manitoba and wisely so. Possibly we have made great mistakes in the past, we had been flooded and we're just afraid of the water; we didn't want to see any water around; we've been thinking of drainage too much but maybe the time has come, I for one, possibly have made a mistake, I admit it, by thinking of drainage all the time and not of water conservation. There's nothing wrong in changing one's mind and I would like to see the Minister look into the possibility of having a real conservation program. He hinted to us awhile ago that he might come out with some programs along those lines -- I don't know what he's going to tell us when he comes to that point in his estimates possibly -- certainly I would welcome a program of trying to investigate all the possibilities on the tributaries of the Red River and in fact, all over Manitoba with respect to water conservation. Let us conserve our natural resources as much as we can.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have discussed this in and out and it looks as though we might go on ad infinitum if we're not careful and I would like to have this finished before we rise tonight and not have a number of speeches if we can do it all within the one speech. I think we have pretty well come to the end now and I would like perhaps the Minister to make a statement.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): I hope to wind up this item by answering the Honourable Member for Rhineland. In the annual report many of the activities of this department are spelled out with respect to the fairly comprehensive service that is given by the engineering branch of the department to the local authorities with respect to the operation of the lagoons; with respect to training of their personnel who operate the water treatment and sewage facilities in these towns. This is given quite a bit. With respect to lagoons, I think our Chief Public Health Engineer is as knowledgeable as anyone with respect to the smaller lagoons and the advice I have is that they work very well, and certainly in communities that I come from and so on, we never have much problem at all with odour. I think it's when certain blood products and so on get into the smaller lagoons that you will get odours, especially where the poultry and other plants discharge blood into lagoon systems. However, the smaller lagoons as we have indicated earlier have been designed to be impervious to the drainage and contamination of subsoil surrounding them, but I think the long term effects of a lagoon, larger lagoons, which receive any degree of industrial waste is still in some doubt. I know that continuing research is being done within our own department with respect to lagoons and information is being gathered all the time. With respect to rural pollution as I indicated earlier, in co-operation with the provincial bacteriologist, the standards for safe bacterial quality of private and public water supplies are reviewed periodically; technical information is provided the public in regard to problems of good water supply and sewage disposal. We offer a comprehensive consultant service in that respect and this is offered to all local government districts in the area and the policy of the commission with respect to discharge of sewage into natural courses and waterways in the rural areas is under the commission's overall jurisdiction in that they offer advice and keep these things under constant study.

MR. GUTTORMSON: During the course of the evening's debate we discussed the various phases of agriculture and whatnot, but one thing I would like to ask the Minister is what is the government policy on pollution? What is proposed by this government regarding the pollution of the Red River?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, no, I am sorry, I still haven't got an answer to my questions from either the Minister or the Minister of Agriculture. Does the government intend to proceed with the diversion from Lake Manitoba into the Assiniboine River? Now if the Minister won't answer that question -- has the Metro Council approached the government in this regard? The Minister said that they had not approached them on the basis that I said. Did they approach the government on another basis?

MR. HUTTON: . . . . that question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item (2) passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, we're not getting any replies on policy here from the

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd)..... government. I think it's a perfectly proper time to be getting replies of this nature. We've asked the government on a number of other items for their policy statement; they will not give them. Here is another case where again apparently they have no policy or will not tell the House.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Health in discussing this problem said very specifically that a representative of the Water Control and Conservation Branch was taking part in the review with Metro of the whole problem of water pollution. Now how the Honourable Leader of the Opposition can ignore a statement like that is beyond me.

MR. MOLGAT: Has Metro approached the government with regard to this canal, that the Minister of Agriculture promised last fall? That's the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (3) Preventive Medical Services, (a), (b) passed, (c) passed --

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Mr. Chairman, on Preventive Medical Service, Mr. Chairman, last year and the year before I asked the Minister of Health and the Minister of Agriculture what they were doing for the prevention of brucellosis, or undulant fever, or cow disease, as they call it in the packing plants, and at that time they didn't get any answers. I notice that in 1960 there were 31 cases, in 1961 there were 29 cases of brucellosis. I understand that it's quite high so far this year and I wonder if the Minister of Health could tell us if they are working on a vaccine for human beings. They have it for cattle, and I don't want the same answer as I got last year and the year before as the Minister of Health says: "Well, see the Minister of Agriculture, it's his cows," and the Minister of Agriculture said, "See the Minister of Health, it's his humans," and I'd like an answer.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, a number of people have approached me and they are quite concerned about the quite serious and quite sharp increases in the number of communicable diseases --(interjection)-- Yes, that's one of them -- I will, I will, but I'll say it when I get to what I want to speak, and when you want to speak you can get up and say anything you want; you're quite good at it. There's really no need for the honourable member to interrupt me, Mr. Chairman. If members will turn to page 26 of the report issued by the department, they will see that the incidence of infectious hepatitis jumped from 555 in 1960 to 1335 in 1961. This is apparently a disease which is increasing in incidence all across Canada, but this is a very sharp increase. I was told by a doctor in whom I have a good deal of confidence that there was an attack of hepatitis in one of the provincial institutions at Portage la Prairie, if I remember correctly, and the doctor told me that he couldn't understand why it happened because he said that as soon as there was the first incident in the institution that every person in that institution should immediately have had an inoculation of gamma globulin and that if this had been done it would have been stopped short. Now I am not an expert in this field but I have a good deal of confidence in the doctor who gave me this information, and I would like the Minister to tell us what the department is doing, either through the supply of more vaccine or, as I think is often required, not in more medicine but in more information to the public. We had an outbreak of diphtheria in a corner of my constituency and it seems to me that as soon as there was one or two cases that there should have been a door-to-door canvass of that area, or a distribution to the homes of literature through the school in that area, telling the people that they had better get in to be inoculated. I'm wondering if that was done, if it was done, why did we have not one or two cases, but we had -- I'm speaking from memory -- almost a dozen cases in that one area.

Now, I don't think that members this year should let this item pass without asking the Minister what the department is doing about the very serious increase in venereal diseases in this province. The chart on page 31 shows that from 1350 cases in 1957 we now have in 1961 about 2250 cases, a very sharp increase. It seems to me that the department -- and the report says that this is contrary to the trend across Canada. Now if this is true it seems to me that the Department should be giving some very serious consideration to this matter. It should be devising programs which will get us back to where we were in the early 50's and during World War II. One other matter, Mr. Chairman, I haven't got the figure here, but I notice in the newspapers in the last couple of days that we had -- I am speaking from memory -- seven or eight or nine cases of scurvy. Now I thought that scurvy went out with the sailing ship and the use of salt pork. Surely we know enough about nutrition now that there ought not to be cases of scurvy, and surely in the affluent society or the buoyant economy that the Speech from the Throne talked about that we don't have people in this province who can't afford an adequate diet

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd) . . . .so that we have cases of scurvy, so I assume that it mustn't be -- it must be not lack of money but it must be lack of information, or as somebody points out to me that we find it on page 33 of this report, there were 14 cases of scurvy reported and of these six people were of Indian descent. Well I want to suggest to members of this committee that 14 cases in the province are just 14 cases too many and in the year 1962 we know enough that we can avoid it, and it seems to me again here that it may be a lack of communication between the department and the people concerned. I'm concerned, Mr. Chairman, because in this item for Preventive Medical Services, there is really practically no increase in the service or in the money which is being asked for, and it seems to me that in the light of these few cases which I have cited, and it's by now means, I am certain, a complete run-down of the work which is done by this department, that we ought to be doing a good deal more than we are.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to reply to some of the questions. I don't think we're trying to pass the buck in any way here. The facts are in front of you and these are matters of continuing concern, and certainly I feel one of the real functions of this department and a very interesting part of the department, sometimes a little more pleasant to administer than certain other aspects of the program. In undulant fever, as the Honourable Member from Elmwood is familiar with this illness, the abattoir workers and farmers obtain this from, as they know, from meat that cuts on the hands and abrasions and so on, and from drinking unpasteurized milk, and the secret is to eliminate the disease in cattle by elimination of the disease at its source, prevention, and we, through our department, education and other areas, and certainly in the large packing houses as he knows, and in the meat industry, this is continually being brought forward despite the efforts of the Department of Agriculture, Health and Animals Branch, and this is a disease which always has to be considered when you especially run into people working in this type of industry or in areas where unpasteurized milk is drunk because it is a disease characterized by an undulating fever and it always has to be ruled out and medically it's ruled out by a series of what they call a glutination test -- tests of the blood -- and it's a very tricky thing and it is treated successfully these days with Chloromycetin. However, the secret really in undulant fever is the elimination of the disease in cattle which is a program of the Health and Animals Division. In all these diseases you have to be constantly on your toes, and again taking the problems mentioned by the Member from St. John's, I don't think anything -- every so often we'll go along for a few years with very few cases of diphtheria and then all of a sudden we get a rash of the m. These are often caused by a carrier getting into an area where the child has not been immunized. Now we carry out fairly comprehensive immunization across the province. We continue to preach this story through all our media, if at all possible. The materials are offered free in that illness, it is a totally preventative illness; it's one of the few two or three illnesses in the history of medicine where you can give a patient a needle and say he'll never get the disease.

In scurvy, certainly there's no need in this day and age for scurvy, but I ran into scurvy in well-to-do families in my practice in my time, and it's that simple. I've seen it in adults living on improper foods during the winter months. I think the town of Gimli is the place where the biggest scurvy epidemic in the history of North America occurred in 1876, and I would say that in the north, our Northern Health Services have done a great deal to lower the incidence of scurvy throughout the province, and we're continually talking about this; pediatricians are talking, the Health Department, Canada's Food Rules, we're continually saying vitamin C, a teaspoon of orange juice a day will prevent it, and we mustn't let down on any of these areas. I welcome the message that the Member from St. John's brings because we cannot emphasize this enough. You can keep saying it over and over again every day of the week and our department has been most diligent through the department in doing this.

Now with respect to infectious hepatitis, this is a disease which seemed to flare up in Canada after the last war, and gamma globulin which is the only treatment known -- this is a virus caused by carriers. It will break out sporadically. It's on the increase across Canada. I think it's -- again, these figures, I'm not saying they are, but I'm sure that reporting is more adequate now. Reporting. Often people had this but it was never reported. But in view of the fact that when cases are reported the department supplies gamma globulin to family contacts, we I think, are getting more reporting. But all the gamma globulin does is reduce the severity of the illness if it's severe hepatitis and the epidemic that we had at Portage last

(Mr. Johnson (Gimli), cont'd) . . . . . year in the infirmary ward amongst the more bedridden, it was a mild epidemic and undoubtedly brought in by a carrier that you cannot recognize. There were no deaths; all cases were isolated and gamma globulin was given to all the staff and to all close contacts of the people in the wards and the increased incidence was evident all over the province. And here's an instance where we have no specific preventative measures to eliminate it. It's a matter of personal hygiene, cleanliness and the identification of the disease early. It's especially important in the first trimester of pregnancy to isolate any virus or to recognize it.

With respect to venereal disease, I noticed this trend last year and the staff has put it very graphically in this year's book, but I don't really know the experience in other provinces, although the general feeling in the department seemed to be that others weren't having the same experience. Then again, I'm not saying this is the total answer but I think it's part of it, as you know our facilitation process by which we pay and supply the physician with the -- any physician reporting a case of this to us which he treats privately, we supply the medication and send it to him as a stimulus to have them keep us fully informed. My department advised me that the facilitation process in Manitoba has something to do with it. Still that's not the total answer by any means. The answer is to get some -- is in education, is in getting the message to the areas where we know this largely comes from, or the greater part of this illness. And we have many, we have inaugurated in the last few months a program of getting out a few gimmicks to get people into our clinic. As you know, free service is offered at St. Boniface Hospital and it's a matter of getting -- we've even gone so far as to designing some matches that tell these people where to contact us. We're even thinking of, we're putting up posters in certain areas, where we hope to attract these people, and so on. These are the measures we're taking. It'll certainly have to be watched and I don't know what more can be done other than extensive public health education offering a completely free service, encouraging the facilitation process by which we find these people. These are just some of the answers to these interesting problems, but they're certainly very important problems.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I would move that the committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has directed me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

MR. MARTIN: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River that the report of the committee be received.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health, that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Tuesday afternoon.