

THE ANTI-CHLORINATION LEAGUE:

PRESENTATION TO VICTORIA CITY COUNCIL, SEPTEMBER 1946.

216 Central Building,
Victoria, B.C.
September 12, 1946.
To: His Worship Mayor P.E. George,
City of Victoria.

Dear Mr. Mayor: -

Much confusion has been created by the press statements regarding Dr. Cleveland, which has been based on personal, informal and unofficial procedure, which has the effect of confusing issues, as it does in court, when evidence is permitted to be introduced improperly. If the Council wants to make Dr. Cleveland their witness, then we should have notice of this, that is the public, who have given their verdict against chlorination. If the Council decides to make Dr. Cleveland their witness, against the anti-chlorinators vote, then it will also be obliged to accept Cleveland's challenge to Dr. Dolman, the Provincial Health Officer, his own Health Officers, and the recorded verdict against chlorination, in Vancouver, based on unscientific methods of investigation, and wrong conclusions of fact, based on those wrong methods, because these same methods are being pursued here.

We have never asked for a verdict based on the presumptive test, because that method is condemned by Dr. Cleveland and the international water experts. If the City is faced with an expenditure of \$4,500,000, then it will need to replan its water works. Dr. Cleveland has performed that service for Vancouver; but yet it is still challenged by Dr. Dolman, and although this system has all the protectives which learned water experts say are necessary, yet this is not sufficient for the theories of Dolman and his followers, who will be satisfied with no system which does not offer the people poison in place of pure water.

Knowing that the test required by Dolman and Department of Health can never be satisfied, we do not propose to waste the time of your council in discussing these intangible vagaries, but we do propose to take the subject entirely out of the hands of the experts, who agree on nothing but their distrust of every phase of nature, and leave the question to the people, who, like good animals can be guided by their instincts and unsophisticated minds, and decide questions, like good juries do, on the basis of the evidence, and especially on that of experience. Therefore, we ask permission to appear before your council at the meeting on Monday to present a brief, in the interests of the people, and in order to try and put our case back in its proper folder, and prevent our cause being side-tracked by illegal procedure.

Sincerely yours, Harry Langley, Chairman, Anti-Chlorination League.

Victoria, September 19, 1946.

INTRODUCTION

We regret that our old friend Mr. John Day is unable to be with us today, as he would so much have liked to be here. John is seriously ill, and probably will not be able to attend your council meetings again, as he has done so regularly in the past. John has given me able and loyal support on my committee, and I pay tribute today to a worthy warrior, who has fought a good fight, and has almost finished his course; and we know that like the great Apostle Paul, there is for him a Crown of Righteousness. I read over to him this brief at the bedside last night, and he was keen as ever that the city council should pay heed to the warning he has given us often, to place our water system in the hands of a competent sanitary engineer, who is able and competent to save the council so much anxiety about matters it could hardly have time to go into. John desires me to say this: That the Health Officer can speak only what water reports show, but the Sanitary Engineer can protect the water system to the extent that the Health Officer can only report safety.

My thanks are also due to my friend Mr. A.B. Sanders, who has helped me to understand the scientific aspects of this subject; but Mr. Sanders is a great democrat, and believes in the safety of experience, which is based on reliable data; and that the vote of the people is the only safe criteria to follow. Mr. Sanders has also, unfortunately, been ill for some time, and could not give me any assistance in recent months.

BRIEF PRESENTED BY HARRY LANGLEY CHAIRMAN, ANTI-CHLORINATION LEAGUE, BEFORE THE VICTORIA CITY COUNCIL, SEPTEMBER 19, 1946.

YOUR WORSHIP, MISS CHRISTIE AND ALDERMEN:

A lot of time has been spent discussing this question of Chlorination, and it can be said that substantial progress has been made by our opponents, without opportunity for discussion or reply. When we made our original presentation, Alderman Williams occupied the chair as Acting Mayor. There was no attempt to limit the speaker in any way, and he was permitted to consume actually forty minutes of time without interference by the chairman, who complimented the speaker on an excellent submission. We hope, therefore, since it is desired to arrive at some solution of our problem, that this discussion shall not be limited, and that as a result of this meeting we shall all be better fitted and able, and we hope happy to present our ultimate conclusions to the court of public opinion, which has been so hopeful and so patient in awaiting the action of the Council, following the plebiscite of 1943.

At our last meeting, whilst I was on my feet, a letter was handed to me from a Mr. and Mrs. Willcox, of the Uplands, reading as follows: I had no opportunity to present the letter at the meeting, so I shall read it now: (reads letter)

We have on hand a large file of letters from citizens everywhere. If you will permit it, I shall be pleased to read a summary or some of these letters, in order that the Editor of the Victoria Times

may have the opportunity of knowing that there is serious evidence against chlorination, which he knows nothing about and which he has so often challenged.

One of the matters which should be dealt with at this meeting is (1) Is there to be further submission to the people by way of plebiscite, and if so, (2) Is it to take the same form, and to be in the same language as before?

Next, I think we should discuss the pamphlet issued by the Department of Health, and distributed by Aldermen Worthington and others, with the avowed object of discrediting the vote of the people, and the work of the Anti-Chlorination League. It can now be definitely stated that this Council is pro-chlorinationist, as a result of listening to and reading the words of Health Officers, who have presented their own professional side. It is now time for this Council and the people to hear the answer to the allegations made, and this we are now ready to present to this Council, and to the people at large. We therefore ask that the same facilities for publicity be granted to our League, which represents the over-whelming vote of the people against chlorination. We make this suggestion, and we hope it may result in a motion before the Council, today, that the Anti-Chlorination League be asked to submit a pamphlet dealing with the subject of chlorination of Victoria water, and that such pamphlet shall be printed and distributed, at the expense of the City, to all electors on the city's voting list, together with the pamphlet, which I shall refer to as Alderman Worthington's pamphlet, in order that the citizens may be better informed on both sides of the question of chlorination, and in a position to vote "yea" or "nay" as their conscience dictates.

NEXT, reference should be made to correspondence, dealt with in part before the Council, and somewhat in full, as far as letters from Dr. Cleveland, of the Greater Vancouver Water Board, are concerned. The public, like myself, are mystified, and speaking for myself, we have been entirely misled by what has appeared in the press under such headings as "Mainland Water Commissioner Supports Victoria Chlorination", and editorially in the Times "Anti-Chlorination Epitaph". The Editor of that paper goes on to say: "Unless they search the rushes of adjoining lakes and ponds and emerge with a new Moses, it would appear that Greater Victoria's anti-chlorination forces might relegate to a dear departed past the theories that treatment of this community's water is unnecessary or ill-advised." This editorial is based on a statement by Dr. Hunter in the Council, that myself and the League have accepted Dr. Cleveland as our champion against chlorination. Alderman Hunter is credited with this statement:

In the first portion of his report, Dr. Hunter read excerpts from numerous briefs submitted to the council by Harry Langley, chairman of the Anti-Chlorination League, which referred to Dr. Cleveland as a 'bulwark' of the anti-chlorination group and a desirable expert whose opinion should be sought.

First, my answer to the Editor of the Times is this: That if and when a new Moses can be found, who should desire to lead his people out of their municipal bondage and despair, that he, the Editor, would crush him to the ground as truly and shamefully as Moses slew the Egyptian; and then he would proceed, with contrite heart and spirit to quote that champion of democracy in the old world, that much misunderstood and misquoted patriot, Voltaire, who said "I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it." Such are the words of this inspired, editorial writer in the Times of Monday, in referring to Secretary of Commerce Wallace's public statement on Foreign Policy. After quoting that statement by Voltaire, and he has quoted it many times in the past, we are not surprised that the Editor continues to preach what he does not practice; and that even if we should be successful in rescuing the citizens of Victoria from the undemocratic and

unscientific procedure of chlorination, and all the misery it has inflicted, on its worthy citizens, the only comment which would be elicited from that editorial pen would be the editorial comment as appeared in the Times following the successful plebiscite against chlorination, as follows:

By a very substantial majority on Thursday the electors signified their objection to the chlorination of Victoria's water. Their verdict is not likely to influence the authorities at Ottawa. It was a kind of Gallop Poll question; the tentative answer has no legal status whatsoever. 1700 would chlorinate, and 4,266 evidently are implacably opposed to this interference with their water supply.

It is evident from this statement, that the editor of the Times disapprove of our British system of Trial by Jury, and we submit to him and to all who think like him, and there are some on this council who prefer to hide behind what they deem to call scientific authority, rather than accept the safe determination of the question in the democratic way. Now what is wrong with this kind of reasoning? It is the presumption that all scientific opinion is in accord on this and every other subject. This is NOT so. What is the scientific verdict in regard to Vancouver's water? Four international water experts have reported that they differ entirely with Dr. Dolman's scientific findings of fact. Dr. Cleveland himself challenged our Provincial Bacteriologist, Dolman, and our Provincial Health Officer, Dr. Amyot, and Vancouver's numerous health officers, all of whom declared that Vancouver's water should be chlorinated. Do we need to refer to the strong indictment referred to in the Cleveland Report, which leaves our Provincial chlorination experts in the sorry predicament, that they did not conduct a scientific investigation, that our chlorinators could not properly read and determine their own findings of fact, and finally, that Vancouver has such a fine water system and water supply, that it would be sacrilegious to poison it with chlorine and ammonia. Are these British Columbia chlorination scientists yet satisfied? Not at all. Chlorination in Vancouver has been stopped. Cleveland has won a great Victory - a noble victory. And the people were never so happy, after three years of suffering and shame; their water poisoned by order-in-council, without the slightest effort on the part of the great scientist who did it, taking the trouble to even visit the water sheds. Yet our noble editor, and some of our gallant aldermen would have the people believe that it is as if God had spoken, and God himself had declared that our water wasn't fit to drink, unless it is poisoned by chlorine and ammonia. That is the kind of fetish that some of our presumed masters would have us believe, that so-called science is impervious to error. Never in the history of this Dominion was there a case where the scientists have been in such disagreement on principles; never have they been so divided; and I am sorry to add, that never before have there been such sharp reprisals, such words of reproach as have been hurled between scientist and scientist. The defeated scientists will not down, and their words are quoted by editors and aldermen, as if the Almighty had spoken in Sinai thunder, his warning to the people of this earth, not to drink of this water, because they who drink of it (like Adam and Eve in the garden, the forbidden fruit) shall surely die. But, there has been no death; Vancouver citizens have been singing songs of joy, and they are thankful to Cleveland and the American experts, who have saved their sparkling Capilano water from the vandalism of the pseudo-scientists. In a small way, it is, with God's Grace, our fervent hope, that with the help of the overwhelming majority of people in this community, we shall yet save (in spite of the Council) the pure and safe water, which has blessed the people of this community for over forty years, and which Mr. H.A. Leverin, an official of the Department of the Interior, declared, after a first hand examination of the watershed in 1938: "The water system of Victoria ranks with the finest in the world. The water is crystal clear and pure." The movement against chlorination in Vancouver was a layman's movement, and it is now declared to be a layman's victory, supported and subscribed to by honest scientists," who refuse to be threatened. So may ours be a Victory for the common people in Victoria. When experts disagree, it is peculiarly a

matter for a jury. So say our great jurists. It is part of our democratic prerogative to determine questions of fact, and whether the editor of the Times likes it or not, the people will go on determining questions of fact, based on experience.

This brings me now to Alderman Hunter's statements in the Council. Never have we at any time stated that Cleveland is an anti-chlorinationist; never have we stated that he supports our stand in Victoria. Our correspondence with the Council will disclose that we had sufficient confidence in Dr. Cleveland that we would recommend his employment to make a scientific investigation of our water-sheds, in order that he might assist us to determine what course of action should be taken to protect our water supply from the necessity for chlorination. And this only became important in relation to the gradually weakening position of the aldermen who believed the silly statements of the Health Officer concerning presumptive tests, to the extent that samples of water were sent to Vancouver and elsewhere for test, against the strong findings of fact contained in the Cleveland report, that water tests were only relevant in relation to an examination on the ground, and in relation to the history of water-borne disease, or otherwise. These reports still disclose no pathogenic bacteria, nothing disease-producing; and if we take the presumptive tests in relation to the history of our water, then it is a history of safety. Never have we had a single case of water-borne disease. Therefore it can be presumed, as Leverin said and as he found, that our water is not only safe, but lovely, and we ought to be willing to give thanks for such crystal pure water, and we ought to be willing to believe and tell the world, as he did: "The water system of Victoria ranks with the finest in the world."

We hope the mystery may be cleared up, how a personal letter from Alderman Hunter to Dr. Cleveland became evidence before the council, and made to appear as evidence in support of chlorination. We are going to attempt to show that Cleveland has given no such evidence, in any event. Further, whether any of this correspondence originated in Committee, by resolution, or in Council, by motion. Unless it did, the Council does not need anyone to tell them that it is not relevant, not evidence, and of no value. But the correspondence does become of value to us, and we can use it, because it has been handed to us by an alderman, who was honest in thinking we should know something of how the discussion arose, and how it came about that Dr. Cleveland has expressed himself, in a limited and guarded way from a report which was enclosed in the letter, by Mr. John Baxter, writing for Dr. Hunter and someone else. The press took hold of this Cleveland letter, and read into it what is not there, just as Dr. Hunter innocently stumbled as he gloried in his surreptitious finding, however unlawfully procured, howsoever wrongly interpreted. We would not rob Dr. Hunter of his moment of joy, when he sought to rob our side of a mighty strong witness. But if the gallant alderman rejoices in his pretended victory over the rules of procedure and evidence, then he is bound also to accept Dr. Cleveland's findings of fact against Dr. Dolman, and against Dr. Amyot, and the Vancouver Medical Health Officer, supported as he is by four great international experts, that Dolman was wrong, and Amyot is wrong, and Vancouver Health Officers are all wrong, when they declared that Vancouver's water should be chlorinated. Will the Alderman accept that verdict? We hope that he will because it is on the kind of evidence employed by these scientists (the chlorinators) that Victoria's water has been chlorinated.

The Alderman is now in this position, and the council is also in the position, that the statements of Dr. Cleveland, procured surreptitiously and improperly, are not evidence which the council can use against the purity or otherwise of our water. Second, such statements by Dr. Cleveland was based only on presumptive tests, which the experts state are not admissible unless there has been an investigation on the ground, and even then, they must be taken in relation to the history of our water over a number of years; and that history leaves nothing to be desired. We have that record, and it

has been confirmed from year to year by succeeding Health Officers, who have declared, until recently, that our water is beyond compare and is proved to be safe and glorious.

But if the Council cannot use Dr. Cleveland's statements, the defense may use them for what they are worth, and make them part of our case against chlorination. Therefore, let us examine Dr. Cleveland's words, and not presume or read into his words what is not there.

John Baxter, on behalf of Dr. Hunter personally, submitted to Dr. Cleveland a copy of water samples taken by the presumptive test, and asked Cleveland if water of this kind should be chlorinated. And this report concerns only Japan Gulch. The Alderman did not dare to send reports of Hump Back reservoir, which leaves nothing to be desired by even our enemies. Japan Gulch, be it remembered, is part of our Goldstream system, acquired at enormous expense by the City from private interests, with the object of controlling the major water supplies, so that Esquimalt and Greater Victoria could be brought into a Water Board. No sooner did the city acquire this water system, than they proceeded to denude the water sheds of their valuable timber, and it was a matter for no concern to the Council, that Hindus whilst engaged cutting this valuable asset, were not provided with sanitation during the demolition; and not until my friend John Day complained, was any sanitary provision made to protect the water from fecal matter. The council was so happy in its employment of the dollars to be made from the timber, that no alarm was raised; with the result that today, we have no protecting timber area at Jack Lake. But even so it was never once reported by our Medical Health officers that there was danger from water from this area. In fact, in all the many years that this water was used by the people of Esquimalt was there ever a complaint against its purity or safety; and the only complaint today is that there is a high bacteria content. But there is still no evidence of pathogenic bacteria, only presumption of guilt, because of high bacteria per c. c. But the experts do not condemn a water because of high bacteria content, unless there is also a history of disease. There is no such history. Now let us examine Dr. Cleveland's very first guarded words, and see what we can find. I quote: First, let me say this, that John Day and myself have discussed with Dr. Cleveland these same reports, and we know what his views on this subject are. Dr. Cleveland is a very astute gentleman. He knows his subject well, and if the Alderman had read Cleveland's words carefully and with understanding, he would have discovered that he was supplying food for thought, and in no way contradicting his former statements as to the proper way to make water tests, and the conclusions to be drawn from such tests.

While the analytical results submitted from Japan Gulch source show that a large proportion of the total number of samples contained bacteria of the *ecoli-aerogenes* group, this does not constitute proof of the presence in the water of disease producing organisms. The past record of use of the water suggests that it actually has not carried infection of any consequence." In that respect, Dr. Cleveland does not support Dr. Dolman's theories, or Dr. Anderson's dictum. There is no victory here for the Alderman for chlorination.

We will not stop here, because Dr. Cleveland goes on to speak on the uncontrolled character of the water-shed, due in part to the existence of public highways. And there is the rub. What has the city done to perfect its water system, such as Cleveland did in Vancouver? Nothing. There is a mere handful of people in the vicinity of these roads, and by arrangement with the Provincial Government, these roads can be closed. We can therefore do away with trespass. In Leechtown, there is only one property paying taxes, and this has been in default. An energetic water board would make overtures to the Government to have this water area closed, because it is important to the safety of our water, and it is the city's duty to protect these water sheds at all cost. Nothing has been done, and all our opponents say in reply to their ineptitude is, we don't care about the

watersheds, we will just chlorinate. If we had the time to discuss it thoroughly, we should submit, strongly, that simply to chlorinate an unprotected area would be no guarantee of its safety. The inference to be taken from Dr. Cleveland's remarks is just this: Why don't you protect your watersheds? Why didn't you invite me over to Victoria and let me show you how to make your water safe, by protecting your watersheds, and making chlorination unnecessary -- as unnecessary as it is in Vancouver, because, I, Cleveland, made sure of the safety of my watersheds. But does Dr. Dolman agree with Cleveland and his safe watersheds? No. As the experts have said, "Water from Heaven would not satisfy Dolman." Hence, Dr. Cleveland only advises, if he advises at all, on a condition which results from our neglect, and he says in fact, "Well, gentlemen, if you can't perform the first essential of protection, well then, stupid people, of course, chlorinate." Had Cleveland been invited to make a thorough inspection of the watershed (Japan Gulch) there is no doubt he would recommend that the area should be enlarged, the roads closed at all cost. That our pure water is more important than preserving a few shacks. Then there is next the question of the Railway, which touches a portion of the shed. We discussed this objection with Dr. Cleveland, and his answer was quick and responsive. Why can't you have the Railway Company have these toilets closed by order when the train is crossing the water shed? That sounds reasonable, and it is a precaution taken by railway companies all over the world. But, gentlemen, when you are looking for a case, you can make one, if only you refuse to take precautions, and do nothing. Our water is our greatest asset, and if we do not soon protect it from danger, then the Government will soon take it over, and they will create a water board which will perfect a water system and water supply as good and safe as exists in Vancouver. Not anything that will be satisfactory to Dr. Dolman, and his satellites, but safe and satisfactory to the common people, who are the people concerned.

In the old days, there was no Malahat. All the population which existed in the horse and buggy days, was on foot or by stage. There has been no increase in population in this area, but a decrease. The onus is on the Health Department to show cause before making complaint of a dangerous condition, and this they cannot do. First, we look for action by the Sanitary Engineer. The Health Officer does not come into the picture until the Sanitary engineer has done his work. We have no Sanitary Engineer. If the time should come when the speaker should take his place in this Council, we shall demand the appointment of a Sanitary Engineer, and then we don't care a continental if there is a Health Officer or not; as we are satisfied from long experience that Health Officers make practically no contribution to health, and in the next few months we intend to make an attack on this department for its failure to touch the vital question of health. I have in my hand a synopsis from some of the world's leading physicians and surgeons, who condemn the system practiced by our Department of National Health, with vehemence; they use language which if we employed it, we should be charged as having our chin out. 20,000 people vaccinated as a protection against some returned service men in Seattle, who had got small pox after being vaccinated. What is this theory? In 1914, out of 100 vaccinated soldiers in Egypt, 96 contracted small pox. There is need for an investigation of the claims made by the Department of National Health, and if we are to build a strong nation, we must get away from disease and preach health. If we could have our way, we would establish a Health Department in this City, with a Physical Culturist, a Dietitian and a Psychiatrist in charge, with a Physician and Surgeon only in an advisory capacity.

Before we leave Dr. Cleveland, let us examine his final words, so comforting to Dr. Hunter: "The nature of the catchment area is such that heavy sewage pollution of the water supply in the sense experienced by many cities is most improbable and on account of the relatively small organic content of the water to be oxidized the chlorine dosage required for disinfection or sterilization is SMALL. This again is contrary to the findings of Dr. Dolman, and contrary to the practice in Victoria. And these words are based only on Japan Gulch, and because we have refused or

neglected to put our watershed in a safe condition, which I have dealt with. Then there is little comfort in Cleveland's last paragraph: "Under such circumstances there appears to be little need for pre-ammonization of the water, and it would seem to be the part of wisdom to carry on for a while experimentally with chlorination only. Careful observation may disclose no advantages from the additional use of ammonia." Having failed to comply with the repeated request that the city call in a water expert to investigate on the ground, and to make recommendations for the better protection of our pure water supply, the only value of this report of Cleveland's, and it is of value to our side, is the strong case which is made for the proper protection of the watersheds, by the elimination of roads, so little used, and the protection by closing the toilets on trains, or else the removal of the line altogether from the watershed. There is nothing too great which can be done to protect our pure water supply.

THE EVIDENCE AGAINST CHLORINE

I quote from page 505 of *Materia Medica*, Vol. 1, by Dr. John H. Charke, M.D.

We have received similar evidence from members of the League. I myself have suffered similar effects, and continued distress since chlorination.

Evidence of Dr. Frank McEown, M.D., Vancouver, in reply to a Vancouver Surgeon, who defended Dr. Dolman.

Evidence of Dr. Fewster, M.D. (quote)

EVIDENCE from St. John, Oct. 1945. (quote)

Dr. Cleveland's letter Sept. 11, 1946, first two paragraphs.

We have such a pile of evidence on file that to refer to even the material part of it, would keep you gentlemen here all day.

The water reports which I have examined for several years, signed by Dr. Felton, are signed "No fecal contamination; and during the period that Dr. Burman took over, the same kind of reports, no fecal contamination, until we reach the period when Alderman Worthington could not longer ignore the demands of our Mr. John Day to clean up an unsanitary condition at Japan Gulch, which disturbed the soil, which had been contaminated, and then we note for the first time, the presence of B-Coli. This, of course, was during the period that the Federal Govt. employed Dr. Dolman, and the Federal Govt. demanded chlorination for the duration of the war, but not thereafter. When proper figures are shown, we find that the water has been uniformly safe over the whole period when tests were made, which confirms the report of Dr. Leverin, the Federal Inspector.

Looking at Dr. Cleveland's Report to the Provincial Govt. on the question of Joint Control of Water Supply to the Cities and Municipalities of Greater Vancouver, prior to the formation of a Greater Vancouver Water Board, we find the same conditions had to be overcome as have been complained of at Japan Gulch and Humpback. Lumber interests, and areas which were occupied by a few settlers, had to be cleared up, and they were cleared up until Dr. Cleveland created what is stated to be the most magnificent Water system on the American Continent. Yet this did not please Dr.

Dolman, although not long prior to chlorination Dr. Dolman had voiced the highest praise of Vancouver's water.

There is so much of prestige involved in this matter, so much of loyalty to the Department of Health, and to the particular school of thought, that the public should view with suspicion any and all attempts to pass on this question from the technical standpoint. Science has brought us to the most dangerous period in the history of man. It behooves our democracy to regain control and maintain absolute control where experts are concerned. The people are concerned in this, and before it is too late, we must call a halt to this base attempt, by experts, to doom mankind to a gainful existence, and perhaps to final extinction of man as living, vital, spiritual force, without faith, without hope, and without purpose.