

"The next point to which I wish to refer is the fact that at the time I gave my opinion on the matter, and I may say that I held very strong views personally that this was not such a scheme of reclamation of False Creek as was anticipated, as under the False Creek Foreshore Act, the property reclaimed, was to belong to the city, but under the city agreement the larger and more valuable portion was to go to the railway company. And after the bylaw was passed and the agreement approved by a very large majority, it was for the government to do its duty in this direction, because after the railway company came to the government and stated that they had spent two millions in buying lots abutting on the Creek, we wanted to put no obstacles in the way of progress, but to assist capital to come into the country, and to encourage the entrance of the Great Northern as well as other railway companies. We had before us, particularly before myself and my colleagues from the city of Vancouver, the fact that this bylaw had been carried by a vote of four to one, and as I said before, I think the only reason for passing the bylaw was to bring pressure upon the government to pass the agreement, an agreement which I thought, and still think, was an unwise agreement for the city to enter into.

#### **Have Received More Than Ever.**

"The agreement has now been modified, and I would ask how it comes that if the Great Northern had given all the privileges they could give to the city, that they modified it, and now give us greater than we have before. (Applause.) After the agreement was passed it was found that there were certain lot owners owning riparian rights on False Creek, and these rights had to be extinguished before the company could proceed to fill in the Creek. They found they must get rid of a small minority of owners who had rights on the Creek, and they came to the conclusion that the easiest way was to come to the government and laying their plans before us, get us to allow the city to expropriate under the Foreshore Act. I, of course, held strong views on this matter, but from my position, it was my duty to advise my colleagues, and having done so I received the most unjust criticism from some of those in Vancouver who were

interested in connection with the original agreement. I felt then as I feel now, that in this, as in other matters, I have attempted as well as my ability will allow to advise my colleagues to the best advantage. It may be that some excited people, led by false prophets, foresaw my political ruin; but if the time should come when I go down to defeat in Vancouver, and I feel it will be many years in the dim and distant future before that occurs." (Applause.) "I still propose to follow the course I have laid down, to be honest in my convictions, and to speak accordingly, and so I advised as I did." (Applause.)

MR. BREWSTER: "This seems to be a somewhat extraordinary procedure. The honorable gentleman is making a speech in committee on a bill introduced by message, rather than going through the usual procedure, and speaking on second reading, he is leaving the beaten path and making a stump speech. No one knows what he is talking about except himself, as no one else has had an opportunity to see the bill."

HON. MR. BOWSER: "I have a perfect right to explain my bill at this stage, and I am doing it to save time, and incidentally to educate the member for Alberni. I am only doing this by way of explanation, and if my explanation disturbs the member for Alberni, I cannot help it."

MR. BREWSTER said it did nothurt him, but he did claim that it was out of the ordinary, as members were entitled to have an opportunity to reply.

MR. HAWTHORNTHWAITHE also asked if members would be given an opportunity to reply?

HON. MR. BOWSER assured them that all would have a chance of speaking on the second reading, and at later stages of the bill.

#### **Legal Opinions Obtained.**

"I did not wish," he continued, "to give my own judgment on this matter, and so I obtained the advice of four of the best men I could get in Canada. I placed it before Mr. Wallace Nesbitt, K. C., Mr. Shepley of Toronto, another well-known lawyer, and Mr. Bodwell and Mr. MacLean in this province, and they all agree that this was not such a plan as we could assent to under the False Creek Act, and therefore was not one to which the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council was prepared to assent. I