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ABSTRACT

This is a study of administrative confusion and uncertainty which has beset development of an important part of Vancouver's industrial waterfront.

False Creek is a two-mile long, twenty-foot deep inlet. Half the residential area of Vancouver is separated from the commercial center by this waterway and its shore is extensively occupied by industry.

Originally the inlet was more than twice its present size, but the eastern half and a central mud-flat "bay" were reclaimed by the federal government prior to the First World War. Until 1924 the federal government claimed title to the bed and foreshore but in that year acknowledged the province's claim. It retained, however, the reclaimed area known as Granville Island and owns a large tract of Indian reserve land near the False Creek mouth. At the turn of the century the city was given title to the eastern half of the bed and foreshore, and later made the reclaimed portion available to the Great Northern and Canadian National Railways. The Canadian Pacific Railway owns almost all the upland lots on both the north and south shore of the waterway as it exists today. These are occupied either as terminal yards or under lease. Headlines have been established along its shore and the Navigable Waters Protection Act applies.

False Creek has been a problem area because it is both an obstacle and an industrial area of high utility and potential. The city administration has been able to cope with the former, limited only by the funds available. Any over-all development, however, has been virtually impossible because of: 1) a confusion (before 1924) as to the spheres of responsibility of the senior governments, 2) their tendency generally to act without consideration for the over-all development, and 3) the total lack of co-operation between themselves or with the city in furthering comprehensive economic development.

This has meant that the only development, apart from the federal reclamation, has been the result of private enterprise. It has been the good fortune of the city that this has never, yet, been contrary to the over-all potentialities of the area. Recent action by the federal government indicates that the Indian reserve property may be disposed of for purposes inimical to the best economic use of the shore.

There appears to be no possibility of the city developing the waterway comprehensively by its own efforts, nor any likelihood that either or both senior governments will do so. The answer may lie in a statutory corporation publicly and privately owned, perhaps on the order of the English "mixed undertaking". Such or similar action would be facilitated if the city were able to acquire the False Creek land presently held by the federal government, perhaps by accepting it in payment for the city-owned (1954) airport.
PREFACE

This is the second of two studies made by the writer, of the problems of that part of the waterfront of Vancouver, B.C., known as False Creek.

It attempts to describe and analyse the difficult and interesting situation arising from, first, a failure of federal, provincial, and local authorities to distinguish clearly their separate powers and responsibilities in the area and, secondly, an absence of cooperation between the three levels of government in planning or carrying out over-all development. This study emphasizes the political and administrative side of the problem.

The first study dealt with industrial and economic development and was done in November and December, 1952, for the City of Vancouver's Engineering and Lands departments as part of the False Creek Development Survey, begun in 1950. The industrial survey began with a report on the 14 wood-converting industries of the area and was made by a forestry consultant firm and submitted to the city engineer in September, 1952. The remaining firms -- some seventy -- were visited by the writer to complete the picture. The work was not carried beyond the accumulation of data, however, and no analysis was made at that time.* The

*The writer was initially engaged by the city's engineering department in July, 1952 a) to assess the economic feasibility of certain reclamation and development proposals for False Creek; b) to extend the sawmill survey to all industries, and c) to review possible administrative approaches to over-all development of the waterway. The proposals were not available at that time, however, and the sawmill survey suffered a three month delay. As a result the industrial survey did not begin until the available time was all but used up. No analysis of the large amount of data gathered was, therefore possible and it was submitted in its basic form.
material was gathered as part of a large report then being
prepared for the city council by a staff under the city
engineer and the consultative direction of E.L. Cousins,
P.Eng., Toronto harbour engineer. At this writing the re-
port of the False Creek Development Survey has not been
presented to the city council.*

It is not, therefore, possible to state whether the
writer's industrial and economic survey remains in the
form in which it was compiled, has been made the basis of
an economic analysis of the waterfront industrial basin
(as was first intended), or in some other way is incor-
porated in the full report.

The second study, presented here, was made on the
writer's own initiative and undertaken five months after
the work for the City of Vancouver was completed. Its
relevance and need were first pointed out, however, by
D.E. McTaggert, Q.C., then the city's special counsel on
its charter revision, formerly corporation counsel, and
subsequently alderman.

The material for this study was collected with the
assistance of so many people that individual acknowledg-
ment would require an unmanageable list of names. The
writer's debt to others must, therefore, be gratefully
acknowledged through the organizations with which they
are associated.

These include: the Engineering, Archives, and
Lands departments of the City of Vancouver; the librar-
ies of the University of B.C., the provincial government,
Vancouver city, and the Vancouver Province and Sun; the
the Lands Branch of the provincial Lands and Forests de-
partment, the Vancouver and Ottawa offices of the Indian
Affairs Branch of the federal Citizenship and Immigration
department, and the Vancouver office of the National Har-
bours Board. Generous assistance was also given by the
Lands department of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the En-

*In the last part of 1953 there was a reorganization
of the Engineering department, in which the staff of
the False Creek Development Survey was reassigned.
gineering department of the Canadian National Railway, and the General Agent's office of the Great Northern Railway.

Very considerable assistance in the writing of this work was given by Dean H.F. Angus, Dr. J.A. Crumb, and Mr. David Corbett of the Economics and Political department and Dr. W.N. Sage of the History department of the University of B.C., together with Major J.S. Matthews, V.D., Vancouver city archivist, and Mr. J.W. Wilson, executive-director of the Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board. Although their influence can be found on almost every page, the responsibility for all that has been said, and anything which may have been omitted, lies with the writer.

Vancouver, B.C. December, 1953.

Dennis M. Churchill.
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FALSE CREEK

DEVELOPMENT:
Chapter One: Introduction,¹

The Problem of False Creek.

The False Creek waterway² and its land basin, since the early days of Vancouver, have been an important problem in the economic and social development of the city, first as an obstacle to city growth and men's movements, and also as a potentially valuable commercial and industrial area. Government bodies and private enterprises alike have been continually challenged to develop them in keeping with the needs of the city of which they are a central part.

Half of the False Creek shore line is occupied today by terminals and industrial plants which are the origin or destination of a substantial amount of the coast-wise water-borne traffic of British Columbia. These businesses, depending upon the waterway for part or all of their activity, represent three quarters of a $45 million capital investment in False Creek industries.³ Today the whole area is zoned for industrial or

¹. Documentation of this chapter has been kept to the minimum, and opinions expressed will often depend, for their substantiation, on material to be presented later.

². Originally about 3.5 miles long (since reduced to about 2.5 miles by filling) and from 1000 to 2500 feet wide, it runs west from English Bay to the heart of Vancouver city.

³. Author's survey of False Creek industries, for City of Vancouver, unpublished, 1952.
commercial use and very little land is otherwise occupied.\footnote{4}

One out of every ten wage earners in Vancouver works in the immediate vicinity of the False Creek basin.\footnote{5} Three out of every five Vancouver residents must cross or skirt the basin in going to and from their work. Thus it continues as a barrier to the movement of people, separating more than half of the residential section of the city from its business and commercial heart. In this respect it has made necessary a major portion of the city's public works - outside of the provision of house-to-house services. In one way or another False Creek daily enters the lives of a substantial majority of the people who live, work, or do business in Vancouver.

With the growing acceptance of conscious public planning as a part of the machinery of government, and particularly with the establishment in the Vancouver city administration of a planning department, the political and administrative difficulties which have hitherto frustrated the implementation of any comprehensive development of False Creek need more than ever to be brought into focus, for only if they are clearly understood can they be overcome. No comprehensive plan has much chance of implementation until they \textit{are} overcome.

\footnote{4}{\textit{The first zoning by-law was passed in 1927. As far as it affected False Creek, it was little more than a recognition of a largely accomplished fact.} }

\footnote{5}{Author's survey, \textit{op. cit.} }
While today it is generally agreed that this False Creek area should be developed to meet the needs of a rapidly expanding commercial and industrial metropolis, there has never been a generally accepted idea of what would provide a maximum utilization of the basin, particularly from a social and economic point of view. Nor has there been any general appreciation of the political problems of such development which arise from the fact that ownership of the bed, foreshore and upland areas of False Creek is divided (almost entirely) between the federal government, the provincial government, the city of Vancouver, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the B.C. Electric Company. This division of the rights and responsibilities between the three levels of government and two private corporations has produced an administrative confusion which has never yet been overcome, and which it is the object here to study.

- 1 -

The False Creek basin and its shallow waterway have undergone a substantial transformation since the time, 90 years ago, when the only human developments of its mud flats and forested shores were the fish traps of the Indians and their village of Snauk (Snauq) just inside the entrance from English Bay.  

6. Nelson, Denys, Place names of the lower Fraser valley, (typescript), Vancouver Public Library, 1927, quoting "from Prof. Hill Tout, B.A.A.S., 1900."
False Creek became important to the white settlers first as an obstacle - a role it has played ever since. It was first bridged in the early seventies at the central narrows (where Main Street is today) to bring the False Creek trail (later Westminster Avenue, and today Kingsway) into Granville. During the next eighty years a dozen more bridges were built across the waterway (half of them were replacements for existing crossings).

As the Vancouver area developed from a "settler" to an urban stage, it became apparent that False Creek was advantageously situated and physiographically well suited for industrial and commercial activities. The resulting economic expansion, which occurred in company with that of the city, thereby became a challenge to public and private interests. Only with private interests, however, was there persistent incentive to meet this challenge, and today's development of the waterway is essentially the product of industrial and commercial growth, as will be shown. This expansion came about through the individual efforts of businesses developing their own holdings in their own interests, unco-ordinated by any public planning.

7. It stretched between the Burrard Inlet settlement of "Gastown" (Granville) and the administrative center of New Westminster and the food supplies of the Fraser river delta. (See map, p. 25.)

8. A remarkable feature of this is that, unlike so much individualistic development in other areas of the city, any regulation and control according to an established plan could not have produced results much better - when considered both physically and economically - than exist today. It cannot be denied that False Creek could have been
Successful development ordinarily is predicated on planning. In False Creek the planning, just like the development, has been by private enterprise. The great social problem of such planning, and its possible danger, is its individuality and the fact that it generally is unrelated to any common plan of development (usually to be achieved only at the administrative level).

That this area of the city, so important in physical location and economic significance, is what it is today without benefit of public planning, cannot but concern both the planner and the administrator. It at once raises the questions - to which answers are sought in this study - of whether effective administrative planning was possible in the past, whether it would have aided or hampered development, and to what extent future public planning and development can be urged in the best public and private interests.

The False Creek waterway and basin are wholly within the city limits of Vancouver. The area, therefore, is the developed as a park and recreational area, with considerably more aesthetic appeal than it now has. The commercial and industrial loss to the city, however, would have been substantial.

9. "The said City of Vancouver shall be bounded as follows: * * * thence along the [south] shore of English Bay across the mouth of False Creek and along the [north] shore line of lot number 185 * * *." British Columbia, Statutes, 1886, c.32, s.2.
administrative responsibility of the Vancouver City Council, which is under the same obligation to provide for the orderly development of False Creek as for any other part of the city. Not only do city regulations and by-laws apply in the False Creek area in the same way that they apply elsewhere in Vancouver, but the council may, within the limits of its municipal powers, make such specific ordinances for False Creek as it deems appropriate and necessary. The kinds of building erected and business done there are subject to the city's zoning, building, health, sanitary and fire regulations.

The foregoing administrative sketch, while correct, is not complete, however. Three matters have so far stood in the way of full use by the city of its administrative machinery to control and plan the improvement and development of False Creek and undertake the expropriations and public works necessary.

The first obstacle, from the point of view of the city of Vancouver, has been financial. Directly from this rises the second - popular uncertainty. The city council has never been in a financial position where it could boldly undertake large scale public works in False Creek, hence there was little to be gained from proposing them. Other needs of a fast growing city have always had a more urgent call upon the capital available. For this reason, while there seems always to have been some popular sentiment in favour of the improvement and development of False Creek, civic administrations have either been unable to bring before the city property owners a plan and a
method of financing its fulfillment, or have had their proposals defeated when submitted to the voters as money by-laws.

Division of Administrative Authority.

The third obstacle to city action in the False Creek waterway has been the council's lack of full jurisdiction. The city has never been the sole governmental authority in the waterway. Only the eastern part of the bed and foreshore are under the control of the city.

The regulation of navigation, and of all development likely to influence or affect it, has always been the undisputed responsibility of the federal government. The bed and foreshore other than that owned by the city, however, were long subject to the conflicting claims of the crown provincial and the crown federal.

Since 1885, when Premier Smithe granted, in the name of the province, large tracts of land on both sides of False Creek to the Canadian Pacific Railway, the provincial government has acted with a free hand in dealing with what it regarded as provincial crown holdings, both adjacent to and within the waterway.

Beginning at the turn of the century, the federal government also acted, when it wished, as though the bed and foreshore of the waterway were held in right of the crown
In addition, besides regulating and controlling foreshore development through provisions of the Navigable Waters Protection Act, it has administered the reclaimed Granville island through the Vancouver Harbour Commission and (after 1936) the port manager of the National Harbours Board, and the Kitsilano Indian reservation through its Indian Commissioner for British Columbia.

The city came into possession of part of the False Creek bed when the provincial government in 1902 made a crown grant of that part of the bed and foreshore east of Carrall Street (on the north shore) and Ash Street (on the south shore). This ownership was later confirmed by federal order-in-council.11 The way in which the False Creek problem was magnified and distorted by this administrative uncertainty will be brought out in succeeding chapters.

Absence of Administrative Co-ordination

The senior governments have, more often than not, behaved in a cavalier way towards the city of Vancouver in matters affecting False Creek. No evidence has been found in this study

10. In 1924 the federal and provincial governments agreed that since False Creek had not been a public harbour at confederation, its bed and foreshore were a provincial, rather than a federal, affair. It was further agreed that all previous grants and actions by either government would be henceforth recognized as valid. (see appendix p. )

11. It was on the basis of this title that the city was able later to negotiate with the Great Northern and Canadian Northern railways for filling and developing the mud flats.
that any works by either government in False Creek were ever undertaken to implement or assist a municipally-originated development, proposal, or plan, or were ever subject to modification in the light of the city's plans\textsuperscript{12} or what it regarded as its needs.

The Canadian Pacific Railway, the largest private property owner in the area, has not been free from an attitude of \textit{hauteur} towards the senior governments and the city council, until very recent years. The railway has always insisted on unrestricted operation of its land and foreshore, reasoning that it possesses a federal charter and that this charter gives it

\begin{quote}
* * * the right to take, use and hold the beach and land below high water mark in any * * * navigable water, gulf or sea, in so far as the same shall be vested in the Crown and shall not be required by the Crown, to such extent as shall be required by the Company for its railway and other works * * *.\textsuperscript{13}
\end{quote}

Thus it managed successfully to resist any action to limit its holdings, modify the use made of them, or be included in any plan or project of which it did not approve, or did not endorse.\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{12} The city's first "town plan" was not drawn until 1927, but from 1900 or before it has had proposals, even plans, for particular development.

\textsuperscript{13} Canada,\textit{ Statutes}, 1881, c. 1, Schedule A, 18 (a).

\textsuperscript{14} The only empirical evidence to substantiate this statement is the company's continued holding aloof from any attempts to improve the waterway or its basin, or its participation only on its own terms or with such reservations as to discourage, or cause the stagnation of, planning action. Maj. J.S. Matthews, archivist of the city of Vancouver, does not share this view. He is of the opinion
While at different times the way was frequently open to each of the three governments to assume responsibility for the comprehensive development of False Creek, it will be shown in this study that at no time was there sufficient individual initiative or a combination of executive and administrative incentive, to carry our any substantial measure. The result was either nothing, or a fragmentary undertaking.

- 3 -

The problem of False Creek — what its course of development should be and, once this is determined, how to achieve it — is dependent for its solution not alone on the physical plan of the engineer. The waterway is an important factor in the economy of the city of Vancouver, and any development which would impair its economic function (even if structurally feasible) would not deserve implementation. Further, the public acceptance of any proposed development, and the legal and financial means to implement it, is a political and administrative questions of the highest importance.

that the C.P.R. had ambitious plans for its township, which he says was the first possessed by the railway, and intended to make its terminal and port city a truly elegant one. He cites, in support of this, the commanding position (then) of the railway's first hotel, and the lay-out for Shaughnessy Heights. Major Matthews blames the city councils of the time for this plan never being fulfilled, stating that whenever the railway wanted to give the city any park space in the Granville peninsula area it was refused as only relieving the C.P.R. of part of its tax obligation.
The implementation of any development plan which includes major public works and substantial direction and control of private development, depends upon the mustering of both power and authority. Without a substantial source of public money - obtained either directly from the public treasury or from borrowing - there can be no power to carry out a project. The same power to be effective, also requires popular endorsement and support.

Authority for the implementation of the planned development comes only from the elected representatives. Either the government responsible to the legislature or to parliament must carry out the works, or statutory authority must be given to some agency, be it a municipal corporation, a development commission, or a crown corporation.

The possible courses of political and administrative action are influenced by, and dependent upon, what has gone before. Just as an engineering plan might be limited by the existence of already completed works, so the political and administrative course is limited by early decisions of the crown and legislatures. The problem of False Creek is, then, less an engineering problem than a politico-legal one.\(^{15}\)

---

15. This was recognized for the first time recently when the Vancouver City Engineer's Department, in the course of its current False Creek Development Survey, decided to approach concurrently its engineering, economic and political problems. The author was engaged for part of 1952 by the city to gather and analyze data in the matter of the last two.
For these reasons it would be most unwise to look forward without first looking back. The objective here is to set out clearly the course of action by the three levels of government. Only then can the problem be adequately analysed and solutions considered.

Of the three obstacles to municipal or other public development in False Creek, those of finances and lack of public support are common enough to merit no special attention. However the third, wherein the city's overall jurisdiction was and is made difficult or impossible by the uncertain, irregular, and arbitrary actions of the senior governments, is involved, unique and important - and worthy, therefore of careful study.

This administrative confusion, it will be shown, was an important factor in the failure to carry out any overall, long-term, planned development. But it also stood in the way of planning itself, for no level of government could, or at any rate would, accept a position of paramountcy when the question of comprehensive planning was under consideration.

If False Creek is to be considered as still in need of a planned programme of public and private development, an understanding of its political and administrative background will be revealing and important.

It is the intention here to trace the parallel courses of devious and uncertain public action (and inaction) and economic
development by private enterprises. At the same time the confused political and administrative situation will be made evident. These matters meanwhile must be set in their economic and social context, which means that they must be treated as a part of the overall development of Vancouver.

In this setting, and with these purposes, the economic and administrative history will be set down to show that False Creek — the waterway and basin — has been and still is a two-fold problem. It is, on the one hand, an obstacle to the easy growth of the city and to the movement of men and vehicles; on the other hand it is a valuable physical feature well suited to commercial and industrial development.

Secondly, False Creek has been, and still is, a challenge both to public bodies and to private enterprise. The former have been faced, for some time now, with the need to plan and develop the waterway so as to (a) lessen it as an obstructing liability, and (b) increase it as an economic asset. Much public effort has been made to meet the former, very little to meet the latter.

The challenge to private enterprise has been, first, to take advantage of its commercial and industrial opportunities, and, second, to integrate economic development with that of the city and to advance it in a manner not contrary to the public interest. The first of these has been met easily and with a large measure of success by private enterprise. The second,
where a measure of public regulation and control is often re-
quired, has been accomplished, as far as it has gone, in almost
a total absence of public overseeing.

This project, then, is an attempt to analyse the non-engin-
eering aspects of the False Creek problem, in terms of the politi-
cal and economic circumstances which have influenced the develop-
ment of the waterway and basin, and to answer these questions:

What is (or are) the basic problem(s) of False Creek
to the Vancouver community?

How adequately have public agencies and private enter-
prises met the challenges of this problem?

Could any alternative action in the past have been
taken which might have better anticipated the problem as
it is today?

What action for the further development of False Creek
is open to public agencies and private enterprises?

The work that follows first deals briefly with the physio-
graphic setting of the waterway. Then follows the body of the
work wherein is traced the uncertain course of political and
administrative action as it affected False Creek. This is pre-
sented so as to relate the False Creek problem to the growth of
the city and the changing social and economic climate.

Finally the future of False Creek is examined and a course
of action proposed to overcome the problems which so far have
complicated and hindered its development.
LOCATION MAP
False Creek

Map showing location of False Creek Basin in relation to the Greater Vancouver and Lower Mainland area.

* * * * *
Chapter Two

The False Creek Basin

The False Creek basin is a slight depression extending eastward from English Bay between the Granville peninsula on the north and the main body of the Burrard peninsula on the south. In its trough is False Creek, a shallow inlet of English Bay. The waterway, through its short length, roughly parallels Burrard Inlet, the main harbour area of Vancouver, which lies less than a mile to the north.¹

At no point does the rim of the False Creek basin rise above 150 feet, and this only between Granville and Cambie streets on the south shore. The one steep part of the basin is found in this area, where at one point the rim is reached in only four city blocks — something less than 1500 feet. For the rest of its area it is flat or gently sloping.

The main business and commercial district of Vancouver lies to the north of False Creek, between it and Burrard Inlet, while to the south and east stretches the greater part of the city's residential area.

¹. See map, page 25.
The Waterway

False Creek is not in size the waterway today that it once was. Its area has been substantially reduced by reclamation and filling, while at the same time its navigability has been much improved by dredging. In the beginning it extended eastward from English Bay in the shape of a lazy S. At its mouth it is less than 1000 feet wide but, before any filling was undertaken, it increased in breadth until it was more than 4000 feet across at the eastern end. Here there were "malodorous tide flats" covered only at high tide, when the Creek was "connected with the central harbour" in the vicinity of where Glen Drive is today.2

At that time it covered an area of some 1000 acres. Because it was shallow and is tidal, large areas were exposed at low water. Much of what was then mud flats and marsh has been reclaimed by filling, so that the water area today has been reduced to about 375 acres. It is now two and a half miles long and has five and a half miles of shore line. Its shape today is that of a much flattened 'U'. Also as a result of reclaiming, a mud-flat area just inside its entrance became a thirty-four

2. Swan, W.G., Town planning aspects of Vancouver and Fraser River harbours, a paper to be presented at the Western Professional Meeting of the Engineering Institute of Canada, Vancouver, B.C., July 11-14, 1934. (Marked "advance proof, confidential".) In library of Vancouver City Planning Department.
The fill for much of the reclamation was obtained when a 20-foot deep channel was dredged in False Creek before and during the first World War. Despite the fact that only tidal and surface drainage waters enter False Creek, there is some silting, and the average depth of the channel today is something less than 20 feet.

Physical Characteristics.

The immediate shore of False Creek is nowhere steep and the land behind it rises sharply only along a very small section of the south shore. In many places the near-level shore has been extended varying distances by filling, either dredged from the channel, or deposited from other sources. The result is a large expanse of flat or gently sloping land where fill and original shore have become largely indistinguishable.

Over the greater part of the False Creek basin the soil is a mantle of clay, gravel, and scattered boulders. Beneath

3. Granville island, as it is called, is separated from the south shore of the mainland by a narrow channel, part of which has become so silted that it is exposed mud during most of the tide cycle. The City's engineers are examining the feasibility of reclaiming this area by filling.


5. This information was almost all obtained from Dr. J.E. Armstrong, who has in preparation a survey report of the Lower Mainland (New Westminster map area) for the Geological Survey, Department of Mines and Technical Surveys, Ottawa.
this mixed mantle, for the most part, is glacial till. Bed-rock reaches to the surface (or within a few feet of it) on the hill back of the south shore between Granville and Cambie streets and Sixth and Eleventh avenues; farther east between Ontario and Windsor streets just south of the original shore line; where the railway cut intersects Clark Drive, and on the north shore immediately west of the mouth of the waterway.

Except for the very limited steep area, the whole basin is well suited to industry. In some places heavy construction requires piles, particularly in the filled sections. Wherever water access is required along the shore, the property must be bulkheaded, for neither the fill nor the original gravelly-clay will maintain, against ordinary water action, a face that is near vertical. Where wharves are built, however, this same feature permits the very easy driving of piles.

The generally flat or low-gradient nature of the basin has meant that railway access could easily be provided to

6. This is fundamentally the same clay, gravel and boulders as the surface material, except that the lower layer was laid down by glacial action and the upper stirred about and redeposited later by the sea. "It is essentially of glacial and post-glacial flood-plain origin with elevation and subsequent erosion **." Kelley and Spilsbury, Soil Survey of the Fraser Valley, 1939, p.8. See also Burwash, The Geology of Vancouver and vicinity, 1918.

7. For one of the footings for the new (1953) Granville Bridge, it was necessary to drive through 120 feet before bedrock was reached. (Armstrong, op. cit.)
almost all areas of it. As a result, nearly all its industry is served by rail, there is immediate access to any part of the area by the four railways serving the Greater Vancouver area, and all four have established yards and terminals in the neighbourhood of the waterway.

The suitable topography for industrial and commercial location, easy access to all four rail lines, and a waterway accessible to small and medium draft vessels, have combined to make False Creek today a very favorable site for the location of commercial and industrial activities desiring a site close to the center of the city's business activities.

Port Relationships.

The deep-sea port activities of the Greater Vancouver metropolitan community are carried on in Burrard Inlet and the New Westminster area of the Fraser River. Secondary port activities (and by that is meant coastal and lighter shipments) are pursued not only in these two main harbours, but in False Creek and the North Arm of the Fraser River as well. It must be noted that harbour activities are not divided between the two. False Creek (and the North Arm) handles only coastwise shipping, but the other two perform this and a deep-sea function as well.  

8. Ultimately the deep-sea activities in Burrard Inlet may drive out most of the coastal traffic. In such an event only the existence of the False Creek waterway will permit the retention of this commerce close to the city.
Between the four harbour areas there is an active interchange of commerce by water. This has been possible because the distance is short and the water route relatively well protected. It is necessary because deep-sea ships cannot enter False Creek. The earliest such traffic was sawn lumber from False Creek mills. Other goods, including iron and steel products, moved by scow from ocean ships in the harbour to consignees in False Creek.9

There is little if any relationship between False Creek and the Fraser north arm, and little reason for it. On occasion machinery which is fabricated in the former is shipped by barge to the latter.

Further development of the False Creek area for water borne commerce, if permitted, almost certainly will be undertaken, depending upon the continued economic expansion of the B.C. coast.

Relationship to Vancouver City.

Almost the whole of the False Creek basin is zoned for industrial use. Much of the area is occupied by light and

9. Rapidly rising towing charges have much reduced this movement in recent times. At the same time, however, there has been a more than commensurate increase in freight movements between False Creek and coastal points by barge and scow.
heavy industry. What non-industrial land remains in the False Creek basin has a dubious role as residential property, but from it there is a high rent relative to the physical investment.

The False Creek basin is the city's largest single area zoned for industry but, except on Granville Island, the industrial development is extensive rather than intensive. The shore line is only a little short of full occupancy. Industrial development of those sections still occupied by residential property is hampered by: the small size of the parcels into which they are divided; the occupancy of nearly every such parcel by a separate dwelling; the absence of rail facilities; and the high proportion of land devoted to streets with the associated high land tax (based as it is on street frontage).

The False Creek area has been, and is, one of good potentialities and few limitations, well oriented to the Vancouver sphere of influence. It is an area that is both a functional part of the city and possessed of a unity in itself. Hence it could always have had, and still can have, its development regulated, controlled, or even planned, either as an industrial and commercial entity in itself or, in the larger sense, as an important and integral part of Vancouver.
FALSE CREEK MAP
PERIOD of 1886

Map showing False Creek area, with major subdivisions and proposed route of the Canadian Pacific Railway line to English Bay and Coal Harbour.

* * * * * *
Chapter Three

Early Developments, 1885 - 1895

No development of any consequence took place in the False Creek basin much before the incorporation of Vancouver in 1886 and the arrival of the Canadian Pacific Railway the next year. The early settlements of Granville (Gastown) and Hastings were on Burrard Inlet and did not extend as far as False Creek either in size or influence.¹ They were connected with New Westminster (the trading and administrative center for the lower mainland, and colonial capital until 1868) by two trails, one of which² followed roughly the line of what is today Kingsway and reached False Creek at what is now Main Street.³

1. For an account of these early settlements (but not of False Creek) see Howay, F.W., "Early settlement on Burrard inlet", B.C. Historical Quarterly, 1937, pp. 101-114.

2. The other, the Douglas road, skirted Burnaby Lake on the south and then went north-west to the inlet, where were situated Hastings, and the summer colony of New Brighton.

3. The original purpose of this trail was not to connect New Westminster with Burrard Inlet, but as a military road to the naval reserve at Jericho. Colonel Moody, the garrison commander, evidently had some fear for the safety of the capital and of attack by Americans. The trail never got much past False Creek, however, and later became the main line of communication between the city of Vancouver and New Westminster. Cf. Green, George, History of Burnaby and vicinity, 1927, pp. 25-26; Howay, op. cit., p.102.
Since that time False Creek has continued to be an obstacle to the easy passage of people and goods. The first effort to meet this problem was a private one,\(^4\) but almost all subsequent ones have been public undertakings. The earliest traffic bridge was built by the provincial government in 1872,\(^5\) the first of four successive crossings of the waterway on the line where today Main Street forms the eastern end. These bridges carried Westminster Avenue (before that the False Creek trail and, after the channel was filled, Main Street) into the town of Granville. The first of the four was soon attacked by tere­dos (worm-like molluscs which bore into untreated submerged wood, eventually destroying it).\(^6\) It was several times repaired and in 1885 was entirely rebuilt at a cost of $2,197.\(^7\) This was the year before the incorporation of Vancouver, and it there­after became the responsibility of the new city.

4. In 1865 the Hastings Mill found its supply of water inadequate and built a flume from Mount Pleasant which crossed the tide marshes of the waterway on a trestle.


6. The need for the first of these bridges is difficult to estimate, for there were less than 100 people in Granville (Gastown) in the early seventies. This small number may not truly indicate the amount of commercial intercourse, however, for "the village had three hotels or saloons" in 1873 and the Hastings mill was just a short distance away. (Sage, W.N., "Vancouver 1886-1946", B.C. Journal of Commerce yearbook, 1946, p.102.)

7. B.C., Report of Chief Commissioner of lands and works, 1885, p. 262. The old one was completely removed and replaced by one 20 ft. wide, with 16 45-foot fixed spans.
The first 'industry' to locate on False Creek, a slaughter house, appeared there at about this time, but it cannot be regarded as being in any sense the forerunner of today's industrial developments.  

1. The Agreement with the C.P.R.

The colony of British Columbia had entered the Canadian confederation with the promise that it be linked to "Canada", and this the federal government undertook to do by means of a rail line. The agreement between B.C. and Canada provided that the rail line would go to the western "seaboard" and that in return the province would give to the federal government, in trust and to be used to encourage and compensate the railway, a strip of land — the "railway belt" — along the route. The statutory terminus of the line thereafter became Port Moody, and at this city the "railway belt" ended.

This condition is of very real significance here, for it meant that all land west of Port Moody — and this included what

8. In the sixties George Black had built up a business providing the ships in Burrard Inlet with fresh meat, which he prepared in a slaughter house on the shore. The Granville residents disliked this and pressured Black until he moved his establishment to False Creek. (This is the recollection of Major J.S. Matthews, archivist, city of Vancouver.)

is today Vancouver (and False Creek) - remained the property of the provincial crown (in so far as it had not otherwise been pre-empted or granted). When the Canadian Pacific decided to extend the line to Vancouver, new negotiations were required between the railway and the provincial government. The agreement between the company and the federal government did not in any way affect or influence the province, except in so far as the federal and provincial governments had committed themselves under the terms of union.

In 1884 William Van Horne, general manager of the C.P.R., visited the western terminus (coming by way of San Francisco). He considered Port Moody ill-suited for the role of terminus, and began negotiations to extend the rail line to Coal Harbour and English Bay, reaching the latter by crossing False Creek.

The C.P.R. therefore asked from the provincial government a right-of-way and large areas of land (everything west of Port Moody, in one request) in return for extending the line as far as Granville. This was the first occasion on which the provincial government was faced with a decision which would have a marked influence on the future development of the Vancouver area including False Creek. There was at that time, however, no indication of the growth that lay ahead. Land was in abundant supply and money and jobs were scarce. It must have seemed wholly within reason to trade a surplus commodity of little

10. B.C., Sessional papers, 1885, p. 130-131.
value for the scarcer jobs, wages and capital investment.
So half the shore line on both sides of False Creek (as well as 6,000 acres of other land) was given to the C.P.R. in perpetuity.

The first implementation of public policy in the False Creek area was wholly reasonable in the light of conditions as they then existed or could be foreseen. The long-term public disadvantage (or, anyway, lack of advantages) which might have been avoided, if future events could have been foreseen, was beyond any planning which men, in public or private office, might reasonably have indulged in.

Apart from George Black's slaughter house, a few squatters, and a little saw-milling by small operators, there was hardly any use or development of False Creek at the time W.C. Van Horne of the C.P.R. and the Premier of British Columbia, William Smithe, negotiated to extend the railway from its statutory terminus at Port Moody to Coal harbour and English bay.

The Railway extended to False Creek.

If, to public men, railways were a matter of national or provincial policy, they were as much a matter of profit to the private men building them. And profit was measured, at that

11. Judge Howay remarks that the Smithe land-grant was an unnecessary bonus. He believed that the railway would eventually have been compelled to extend to Vancouver anyway, in its own interests. Howay, F.W., and Scholefield, E.O.S., British Columbia from the earliest times to the present, 1914, V.2, p.431.
time, in direct subsidies and land grants. It is little won-
der, then, that William Van Horne, when the question of extend-
ing the railway west to Coal harbour and English bay was
raised, claimed all the land west of Port Moody on the Burrard
peninsular as a suitable and proper quid pro quo. Premier
Smithe, however, was in a position where few public men of that
time found themselves. It was of small importance to the
people of B.C. generally whether the railway was extended or
not. Support for the extension to Coal harbour came only lo-
cally from the handful of people in the Burrard inlet settlements
of Hastings and Granville, which were not even incorporated
municipalities.

But Van Horne’s engineers were not satisfied with Port
Moody as a terminus. Nor was New Westminster suitable as a
port, without substantial dredging of the Fraser River. The
part of Burrard inlet off Granville and Hastings mill, however,

12. Victoria was convinced that it ought to be the western
terminus. [The Esquimalt & Naniimo Railway] was
merely a local work, [but] this view did not prevail on
Vancouver Island; there the [E. & N.] was regarded as an
integral part of the [C.P.R.]” (Howay, F.W., British
Columbia, the making of a province, 1928, p.200.)

13. The Admiralty in London supported the Coal harbour ter-
minus, in preference to the others, according to Major
Matthews, archivist, city of Vancouver.

14. The waterfront there was very shallow, and the shore
behind it rose very steeply within a short distance.
was inadequate, and the engineers saw English bay as ideally suited to large scale future development.

The Land Grant.

In answer to Van Horne's request for all the land west of Port Moody - in masterful railway logic he insisted (9 Sept., 1884) that it had originally been intended as part of the "railway belt" and therefore could rightfully be claimed by the C.P.R.¹⁵ - Smithe offered the provincial reserve of Granville (see map), a large section of the Point Grey peninsula lying behind the area which the railway engineers regarded as necessary for future terminal yard and port development, and some parcels in Hastings township which belonged to the crown. Van Horne held out for a grant of 11,000 acres for a while, but Smithe did not move from his offer of 6,000.¹⁶ It was Van Horne who gave in.¹⁷

The agreement was approved by the legislature on February 28th, 1885, and ratified by the Company on April 20th.¹⁸

---

¹⁵. B.C., Sessional Papers, 1885, p.131.
¹⁶. Ibid., pp.129-136.
¹⁷. Morley, Alan, in "The Romance of Vancouver", Vancouver Sun, states that Smithe was willing to give the Company substantial land in return for the extension, but that he was motivated only by his desire to have railway money and jobs available in the province, and that he had no particular interest in one site as against another.
¹⁸. B.C., Sessional Papers, 1886, pp. 460-1, 464, 469.
Instead of the crown land in Hastings township, as first offered, the Company got all unalienated crown land in the Granville township subdivision, all of the Granville reserve except 2.5 acres (after the survey this was designated D.L. 541) which stretched from Burrard Inlet to False Creek between Burrard and Carrall Streets (except for the Granville township, generally known as "Gas Town"), and which occupies about six of today's city blocks) and nearly 6,000 acres south of False Creek and English bay between what are now Cambie and Trafalgar streets and stretching south as far as "the river road", or Marine Drive. This did not include, however, a small section at the mouth of False Creek on the south shore which was held by the federal crown as an indian reserve.

The Railway's Consideration.

The railway company, for its part, agreed that "the terminus shall be established in the immediate vicinity of Coal harbour and English bay and upon land which is to be granted in pursuance of this agreement. [And] the Company shall erect and maintain the terminal workshops and the other terminal structures as are proper and suitable."

19. Reserved for government offices, and later used for the present court house site and the balance given over for schools.

20. Kitsilano Indian Reserve No.6, west and north of what are now Chestnut Street and First Avenue.

21. B.C., Sessional Papers, 1889, p.46.
The immediate plan was the erection of docks at Coal harbour, parallel to the land, and the eventual development of a port at Kitsilano point. In an earlier letter to Premier Smith, Van Horne had required the inclusion of Point Grey lands in the agreement because the directors of the railway believed "that in the event of an extension of their line [west from Port Moody] the terminal city will be built on the land fronting on English bay". 22

Besides the Coal harbour waterfront, the Company now owned title to all the foreshore of False Creek west of Carrall on the north side, and all west of Cambie on the south side, 23 very nearly half in each case. Clearing was begun (February, 1886) in D.L. 541 24 and the land was surveyed and subdivided. A contract was let to clear a right of way from Port Moody along Burrard inlet to Coal harbour and also across the isthmus at Carrall street to False Creek,

22. 9 Sept., 1884, (B.C., Sessional Papers, 1885, p.131)

23. The actual grants were executed 13 February, 1886, to D.A. Smith (later Lord Strathcona) and R.B. Angus (a high Bank of Montreal officer), who were named as trustees for the Company. Crown Grant 98 was recorded as "5795 acres in D.L.526 except for any 2.5 acres reserved to the Crown," and C.G. 91 as "D.L.541 and certain lots in the Township of Granville, 480 acres." These lands were transferred by deed to the C.P.R. by Strathcona and Angus 28 November 1905. ("Memorandum of the Surveyor General of B.C.", 26 June, 1923, Department of Lands, file 48602, #1.)

24. Fires from this clearing are blamed for starting the disastrous fire which virtually wiped out the settlement in June.
along its north side to a point just east of where Burrard street is today (which was the westerly line of the Company's land) and, on the south side, from a point due west of this out past Kitsilano beach (as known today) as far as where Trafalgar street is now located.

On 23 May, 1887, the transcontinental train first entered the newly incorporated city of Vancouver. At the same time the right of way clearing through the False Creek area and out to Kitsilano was interrupted by a dispute as to title. The Company's rights were confirmed, and the next year work on the trestle across False Creek near its mouth was begun. The track was laid across it and out to Greer's Beach. No trains were destined to go even that far, however, for whatever might have been the plans of the Company for terminal development on the south shore of False Creek and English bay, they never bore fruit.

There appears to be no reason to doubt that the original proposals of the engineers to put the deep-sea wharves eventually at Kitsilano were well and sincerely considered. While less protected than Burrard inlet, there was not the narrow and

25. Sam Greer (Kitsilano was then known as Greer's Beach) claimed part of the shore (of the land granted to the C.P.R.) by right of a deed purporting to have been executed by two Indians. This was declared to be a forgery and invalid by Sir Matthew Baillie Begbie, sitting as a court of inquiry from March to May, 1885. "Report of Commission", Sessional Papers, 1886, p. 217ff.
(then) undredged First Narrows to navigate. The original scheme also included building the terminal yards on the level stretch south and west of the Indian reservation. A big factor in preferring this site to the Granville peninsula was the absence on the latter of any but well water, while several streams came down from the Fairview uplands to False Creek and English bay.

Whether Van Horne first intended to construct an interim quayside and terminal at Coal harbour, and later move on to Kitsilano, likely will not be known. All agreements, however, were made in the name of English bay as well a Coal harbour and it is probable that he would not have received the large grant of D.L.526 had there been any indication during the negotiations that Kitsilano was not to be the terminal. It was likely not a matter of concern to Premier Smithe which terminal site was chosen, and the province already had the greater

26. Stuart Cumberland (The Queen's Highway, London, 1887), discusses the intent of the railway company to establish its terminal at Coal harbour. He was in company with "Sir George Stephen, Mr. Van Horne, and other C.P.R. officials" (p.95) during his visit, but he refers only to Vancouver as the terminal. "The Canadian Pacific Railway authorities have decided upon Vancouver [which was then only Burrard inlet], they propose building extensive carriage works and engine sheds on English bay ** **", and may have been referring to the False Creek yards. His remarks (p.83) of how easily the terminal may be defended by fortifications at the First Narrows lend confirmation to the Coal harbour site as being the settled one.
part of Point Grey under lease to the Hastings Mill company, from which a small revenue was derived.

The Municipal Grant.

Whatever the Company's policy was towards False Creek and English bay, it was still subject to modification in 1886. When the new city council made the railway an offer of a 30-year tax abatement on the workshops, yards and roundhouses if these were erected on the north side of False Creek rather than on the south side (as originally announced) the Company accepted, although it meant that water had to be piped from Fairview, underneath False Creek, to the new location, there being only well water available at that time on the Granville peninsula.

27. B.C. & Vancouver Island Spar, Lumber and Sawmill Co.Ltd. This company had been granted D.L.196 in 1865, for which it paid the consideration of £50.13.6d.

28. Vancouver, By-law 33, 17th May, 1887. Agreement signed 23rd May and effective 1st June. Expired 31st May, 1917. It has been erroneously reported in other places (Cf. Morley, Alan, "Romance of Vancouver") that this was a 20-year agreement, and this seems to be the more commonly held idea.

The council apparently regarded the area south of False Creek and English bay as remote and outside the city's community of interest. At incorporation, however, the city limits included not only the Granville peninsula and Hastings mill, but the area east as far as Hastings townsite and south as far as what is today 16th Avenue. The western limit was the Jericho reserve on Point Grey. It must be remembered, of course, that at that time there was only the Main street crossing of False Creek, no settlement on the South side, and the Granville peninsula surely must have appeared large enough for any amount of reasonable developemnt.

The construction crew which had been at Yale was moved to the new site with all equipment, and established near where Granville street now crosses Drake. This settlement, then some distance from the Burrard inlet activities, became known as Yaletown.30

Although there was no longer an actual need for the rail line to English bay, the Company continued to construct the trestle,31 doubtless because failure to do so might have been regarded as non-fulfillment of the agreement with the province, and might have led to a provincial suit to recover D.L.526 on the south shore.

The Canadian Pacific and the Foreshore.

The pressure of growth was felt at this time by the C.P.R., even with its 6,000 acres of land. This occurred particularly along the foreshore, the ownership of which was in some public doubt, although the railway admitted none. The C.P.R. charter provided for it to "take, use and hold lands below high water mark adjacent to its right of way for its railway and other works".32

30. The Yale Hotel, at Drake and Granville, was later built to serve this little settlement, after Granville was cut through.

31. B.C., Sessional Papers, 1887, p.329.

32. Canada, Statutes, 1880-81, Sch. A, Cl. 18(a).
But this was a federal charter, and the extension west from Port Moody to Coal harbour and English bay was a provincial agreement. The question of whether the charter gave the railway title to the foreshore in False Creek (as well as Burrard inlet) was not to be conclusively answered for another 30 years.

Meanwhile the federal government, in 1894, crown-granted to the railway one mile of foreshore on the north side of False Creek, lying south of the railway's yards and terminals. This gave the Company clear title to foreshore where it had begun filling to increase the area available for railway yards. The company required, for its immediate development, title only to the foreshore which was crown-granted to it.

Why the railway company did not ask for more at this time is difficult to understand, for ownership would have been no burden, and would have later been of great advantage (as things turned out). At any rate, here was an example of the Company's loss and the public gain by either faulty planning or an absence of it, on the part of the Company. There is no reason to doubt that a greater area of foreshore would have been granted if it had

33. It was bounded, on the east, by a line drawn south east from a point near where Helmcken and Homer intersect, and on the west by a line drawn south from the intersection of Seymour and Drake streets. At the same time the railway received a grant to 5,300 ft of Burrard inlet frontage between Dunlevy and Burrard. These two grants were immediately adjacent to major undertakings of the railway company. In the latter case it gave title to the foreshore on which stood the Company's docks. Cf. City of Vancouver, Land and Rentals Dept., Map No. 20.
been requested. However, it was not asked for, nor granted, and now rests in the public domain and is still available if public development of False Creek should ever require its use.

2. Early Municipal Public Works.

The growth of the city was so rapid during this time (from an estimated 4,500 at incorporation to 13,709 at the 1891 census) that it was soon restricted by the limits of the Granville peninsula. Expansion was possible eastward along Hastings street, over the False Creek bridge (Main street), or by building a more westerly crossing over False Creek.

The city had inherited the Main street bridge from the provincial government, which had erected the first crossings. It was often repaired, but never replaced by the city until the first street railway was built in 1890. The car barns for the tram line were set up south of False Creek in Mount Pleasant, and a bridge was built strong enough to carry the street cars.

34. Vancouver, By-law 80, 1889 (Streets and bridges, #125,000).

35. The first street car line began at the False Creek end of Granville street, followed this to Hastings, Cordova, Powell, and then out Westminster avenue (Main) to Mt. Pleasant. (Vancouver, "Street railway by-law", 73, 1888. See also Sage, op. cit., p.106)

So fast was development at that time that the car line was planned to be horse-drawn but converted to electricity before it was completed.
Meanwhile a $150,000 by-law was submitted to the city voters in 1888, part of which was to build a crossing of False Creek at Granville street. In January, 1889, this third crossing (the railway trestle and the 'False Creek' bridge were the others) was opened to traffic. Three years later the Granville bridge was strengthened to carry street cars and the Fairview belt-line was completed by way of Broadway. In less than ten years since incorporation, Vancouver had grown around False Creek. The circuit was often very sparse, but nevertheless it was complete. Nor was it as yet industrial, for the only substantial enterprises on the waterway, besides the C.P.R. yards, were three sawmills and a cement plant.

Meanwhile a fourth crossing was being built, largely by private effort of the sawmill (later Vancouver Lumber Co.) on the south shore. It was the first Cambie street bridge and was put into use in 1889.

36. Vancouver, By-law 64, (Streets and Bridges).

37. The purpose of the bridge was less for the few residents of Fairview (as the area south of False Creek between Granville and Cambie was called) than to give the new city a direct link with the Marpole area, where much of its food was grown. The C.P.R. extended Granville St. from False Creek to Marpole after the bridge was built. Besides serving the city, this road also opened up the C.P.R. lands (through which it passed) and was therefore a practical undertaking for the railway.

38. The high land east of Granville and north of Broadway, overlooking False Creek from the only high point in the basin, now became popular and highly regarded for residences. There was then no industry in the False Creek area at the bottom of the hill. (Sage, op. cit.)

Ten years after the signing of the agreement bringing the Canadian Pacific from Port Moody to Vancouver, the new city had a street pattern which stretched from Burrard inlet to False Creek, Granville street extended from Coal harbour to Yaletown and across False Creek to the Fraser river, the C.P.R. yards, several saw mills, a cement works, and a handful of other industries had been established round the waterway, three bridges and a railway trestle spanned the Creek (but the scheme which prompted the latter had been abandoned). False Creek had been declared a navigable waterway, and the new city was not yet ten years old.
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During that first decade the problem of False Creek was primarily as an obstacle - crossings for traffic were built at three locations, and a railway trestle was constructed. The

40. In February, 1886, the provincial government made representations to Ottawa to have False Creek brought under the provisions of the Navigable Waters Protection Act (B.C., Sessional Papers, 1887, p.329).
Besides a desire to have the C.P.R. yards closer to what was then the city, the city's tax abatement agreement with the railway (see Note 28) was also prompted by the feeling that if the yards were located on the north side of the waterway there could be no need for the Kitsilano trestle. (Vancouver, Council Minutes, v. 1, p.312, 11th April, 1887)
The railway completed the trestle, however, but later removed a section to permit passage of vessels and thereby comply with the N.W.P. Act.
economic importance was hardly apparent, although there was some cognizance of this when the waterway was declared navigable. Industry and commerce had not settled there in any great numbers although the city had expanded across and around it to a limited extent. In so far as it was an administrative concern, only the city was affected.

False Creek was very little problem and as yet no challenge in those closing years of the nineteenth century. What need there was for planned development was slight indeed.

The C.P.R. built its line to Vancouver because it preferred the city as a terminus, and because it was paid to do so. It planned its development there because it foresaw a social and economic development. It accepted payment in land because it expected a development which would create a demand for this land.

The government of the province gave to the Company large parcels of public land in what, it may be assumed, was a policy drawn in the public interest. This policy was achieved, or to be achieved, not by a program of public control of social and economic factors, but through the creation of an economic and political environment amicable to the growth of private enterprise. At that time this meant little if anything outside of a laissez-faire policy. There was no need expressed for public planning as it is understood today. Public optimism was high, and it rested on men's faith in economic reward through hard work and divine providence.
As far as False Creek was an obstacle, and required bridging, it needed, and received, planning; but the planning was not extended onto the shores on either side. As far as it was an area of high economic potential, private enterprise would develop that potentiality in due course. And when this development occurred it would be in the most advantageous way. Two necessary ingredients were lacking, however, which we today might wish had been present.

One was vision - an ability to foresee the economic possibilities of the False Creek area. The other was a willingness to encourage private works, and undertake public works, so as best to take advantage of these possibilities without, however, allowing one to outrun the other and have thereby a strangling effect on the orderly evolution. False Creek required (and still requires) a long-term planned program of development which will permit modification during the period necessary to implement it, not only to the changing needs of the waterway and basin, but also to those of the city of which it is such an economically important part.
Perspective sketch of Vancouver and False Creek area showing industrial development in the harbour and waterway up until 1898.
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Chapter Four
The Turn of the Century I, 1896 - 1916

The period at the turn of the century was an optimistic one for the city of Vancouver. It was a small city - just short of 30,000 in 1901 - but its growth rate was amazingly rapid. From an estimated 2,000 in 1886 it increased to 13,709 in 1891 and by 1911 was 120,847.¹

The pressure of both the growth and optimism was considerable, and it was felt in the False Creek area as much as anywhere. An increase in population has two immediate results, both of which affected False Creek and the area around it. There was an industrial and commercial expansion that increased employment, which, in turn, expanded residential suburbs. For a large number of both old and new residents False Creek lay between their places of work and their homes; for a steadily growing number, False Creek provided the location for the industrial and commercial establishments in which they worked. The result of these two new influences was a strong popular pressure on the city council for more and better crossings of False Creek, and for development of its shores to suit the future expansion which all confidently believed to be near at hand.

¹ Howay and Scholefield, British Columbia from the earliest times to the present, 1914, v.2, p.435; Canada Census.
Thus for the first time the city was seriously confronted with the problem of False Creek in its dual role - the obstacle, and the potentially valuable commercial waterway. Whatever particular challenge this might have been, however, was lost in the overall challenge of growth and expansion. The general sentiment of the time was that an influx of people and capital investment would solve any problem. The administrative challenge of the False Creek problem, when considered in these terms alone, was a small one in the optimistic minds of the people, and its answer was not in regulation and control.

It is little wonder, then, that Vancouver's people and government thought of capital developments as necessary only to overcome a difficulty (such as bridging False Creek) or increase the opportunities for private effort (by extending the civic amenities), and never took the next step, which today seems so logical, of using this capital development to direct and control private efforts so as to insure that they would be in the best economic, social and physical interests of the community. There was a failure, regrettably but understandably enough, to undertake development in accordance with a popularly accepted plan aimed at meeting the physical, economic and social needs as they were comprehended at that time.

With this optimistic growth, a money market where borrowing was easy, and a generally enthusiastic outlook, the city

1a. The burgeoning city borrowed quite heavily (see pp 5354).
regarded its development, and the public works which this made necessary, as entirely its own responsibility. There was no civic demand at that time, as there has often since been, on senior governments for financial help in public undertakings.

The activities of the three levels of government during this period are dealt with in this chapter; the development by the railways and private enterprise generally are recounted in the next following.

1. Municipal Undertakings.

The bridges built in the nineties soon proved inadequate for the increased traffic, so great was the growth and expansion of the city. At the election of 1907 the city council put before the voters a by-law,\(^2\) which was approved, to authorize the borrowing and spending of $1,120,000 to build two new bridges to replace those at Main and Granville streets.\(^3\) The money was borrowed on 40-year debentures with interest at four per cent.

and derived considerable benefit from the undertakings so financed. However, the 40-year bonds, some for works of much shorter life than their debentures, became a heavy financial burden in the years ahead.

2. Vancouver, By-law 603.

3. All existing bridges were carried on the books of the city at a capital value of $384,500. This was not represented (1908) by any debenture debt, however.
The loan was sold in London in February, 1908, and construction began at once.

Both bridges were finished in 1909. The Granville crossing (due to be replaced in 1954) had a central swing span and was designated as "high level". It had a channel width of 369 ft. between piers, with the span support in the middle. The Main street bridge was a "low-level" bascule structure. The former cost approximately $650,000 and the latter $350,000.4

No sooner were these bridges completed, than the residential growth between Fairview and Mount Pleasant made necessary a new one at Cambie street. In 1909 the city voters approved a by-law5 authorizing the borrowing of $675,000 to replace the Cambie bridge. This was completed in 1912 and named the Connaught bridge. It was very similar to the Granville crossing in design, although a greater overall length required the spending of somewhat more money.

Before the Connaught bridge was open to traffic the city decided on another crossing, this time between Georgia and Harris (now East Georgia) streets. This was the only bridge

4. Originally, plans called for a fixed span crossing at Main street, but owners of the shore property east of Main street prevented this, the whole waterway having been declared navigable. The bridge is reported to have opened for the first day ceremonies and subsequent inspections, but never to permit passage of a vessel. (Roy Brown, personal observations to author, Feb. 14, 1953)

5. Vancouver, By-law 690.
of the period which was not a replacement. In 1911 a by-law\textsuperscript{6} to authorize borrowing and spending of $550,000 was approved and construction began the next year. This bridge did not require a draw span, for to all intents and purposes it skirted the waterway. (It did, however, pass over the C.P.R. freight terminals and False Creek spur, as well as the installations of the Vancouver Gas Company.) It was completed in 1915 and was then known as the Georgia-Harris Viaduct.

**Capital Costs**

In 1908 the city of Vancouver spent $1,770,095 on capital account, of which $354,515 was for bridges. Its general debenture indebtedness was authorized to $7,585,851, of which some $250,000 - including $109,600 for "streets and bridges" (unspecified) - had not been issued. The figures to 1915 follow:\textsuperscript{7} (in thousands):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Capital Expenditure total (yearly)</th>
<th>Capital Expenditure bridges</th>
<th>Debentures authorized total (cumulated)</th>
<th>Debentures authorized bridges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>$1,770\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>$355</td>
<td>$7,586</td>
<td>$110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>$2,125\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>8,983</td>
<td>1,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>$2,730\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>11,191</td>
<td>1,795\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Vancouver, By-law 888.

7. Vancouver, Financial and departmental reports, 1908-1916
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Capital Expenditure total</th>
<th>Capital Expenditure bridges</th>
<th>Debentures authorized total</th>
<th>Debentures authorized bridges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>$3,187</td>
<td>$431</td>
<td>$14,009</td>
<td>$1,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>4,951</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>20,426</td>
<td>2,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>3,327</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>25,539</td>
<td>2,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>3,518</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>25,803</td>
<td>2,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25,743</td>
<td>2,345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. includes local improvements, subsequent years do not.
b. $110,000 never issued, dropped from list.
c. False Creek bridges only.

In the period between 1907 and 1916, the cost of overcoming False Creek as an obstacle accounted in some years for as high as 25% of general (as distinct from local improvement) capital expenditures and in only two years (1912 and 1915) did it fall below 6%. (During 1913-16 there were heavy expenditures in False Creek by the federal government, but these are dealt with later, see page 73).

While False Creek was requiring bridges involving the spending of nearly $2.5 million in less than 15 years, it was providing a considerable saving to the city in another way. Not until the twenties did the city run its sewers other than to the nearest salt water, and for all the new settlement in Mount

8. The last three years of this period were ones of serious depression, and in 1915 expenditures on poor relief rose to ten times what was spent in False Creek.
Pleasant, Fairview, and adjacent areas, False Creek was the point of emptying. This practice, undesirable as it was for False Creek, allowed the city a substantial saving over what a sewerage system of the type used today would have cost.

The problem of False Creek, in so far as it was an obstacle, was well and quickly met by the city in those early years. The bridges and their replacements were not, however, constructed according to any plan of development for the city, and at that time such a plan would have had little effect. The city's southern boundary was only 16 blocks south of False Creek. This area was not large enough unduly to influence, or be influenced by, the location of the crossings.

In the downtown area the public transit routes served as the framework of a development plan (in the absence of any formal one) and the crossings conformed to this in the absence of any other. The bridge at Granville street was a natural extension of one of the city's three major streets, and the Main street crossing another. The Cambie bridge was the most direct extension, to the south shore, of the Robson and Cambie lines. The

9. Since that time all ordinary sewer outfalls have been removed from False Creek, and only surface water now empties into it. There are emergency outlets whereby sewage could be emptied there if the regular interceptor connections were made inoperative.

9a. The problem became acute enough, and popular pressure strong enough, in the late twenties to have an interceptor system built (1929-33) at a cost of $1.25 million which emptied well out in English bay off Jericho.
Georgia viaduct was intended to bring the Harris (now East Georgia) street line into the city, relieving Hastings Street, but this never materialized.

With conditions as they were in 1900, it is doubtful if an administrative plan for the bridges could have done better, or if a comprehensive plan for overall city development at that time would have placed the bridges other than where they are. ¹⁰

Early Development Plans

The other aspect of the False Creek problem - its potential as an industrial basin and commercial waterway - also came under consideration at this time. The earliest recognition of this challenge was an appeal to have the waterway regulated according to the Navigable Waters Protection Act,¹¹ but the first concrete proposal was made just after the turn of the century. It urged the development of the large area of False Creek lying east of Main street - an area consisting of great shallow expanses, dry at low water¹² - as a medium-depth shipping basin.

¹⁰ The expenditure on the Main street crossing in 1908 cannot be excused so easily. The circumstances concerning the development of the eastern part of False Creek and the influence of this on the bridge, are dealt with in the next section.

¹¹ B.C., Sessional Papers, 1887, p.329.

¹² There are people today who recall being able to walk across large parts of it at low tide. (Roy Brown, personal interview)
for vessels of the coastal type. The area would have become — according to the proposal — a horseshoe shaped basin lined with docks. The area between this horseshoe, and the sinuous natural shore, would have been filled with the material dredged from the dock area. At that time there was no railway development in the area and on the shores were only scattered dwellings. At the same time Burrard inlet was far from the developed state it is in today. There were no major docks other than those of the C.P.R., and no grain elevators.

It is difficult to take this proposal seriously today, particularly when the alternative opportunities for such development are considered. Yet for some twelve or fifteen years the city planned for, and from time to time the citizens voted on, schemes to dredge the mud flats, make the area navigable, and build docks and terminals in the proposed basin. Although the various plans were never approved as by-laws, the ship basin scheme had the backing of the city engineer of the time, Col. T.H. Tracy. Popular feeling for the idea was strong enough to support the construction of the bascule bridge at Westminster avenue, rather than have the city take the more realistic course of seeking a repeal of the navigable provision beyond that point, which could have been attempted and, from the shallow, undeveloped nature of the area affected, might have been accomplished.

13. Vancouver Province, 24th April, 1939, p.5.
Title to the Mud Flats.

The city council early recognized that it had no authority to develop the tide lands in False Creek as matters then stood. There seems to have been no precise definition of whether the area of the bed of the Creek was federal or provincial, but at least it was soon recognized as not being the property of the city. In 1900, therefore, the city applied to the provincial government for title to the Creek bed, and the legislature passed a bill authorizing the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to grant to the city of Vancouver such parts of the False Creek bed as was advisable. The grant was to be conditional upon the area being developed for park or industrial purposes, and it could not be sold by the city.

In 1902 the provincial government turned over to the city that portion of the bed of False Creek lying east of the southerly extension of Carrall street, the area which was registered as D.L.2037. The object was to permit the city to develop the area according to the plans it was then considering for a shipping terminal. In the same year a further grant of the bed and

14. Not until the ownership of the bed was settled (1924) did the city attempt any legalizing action for the presence of its bridges on property which was not the city's. Before it was declared a navigable waterway, the whole of the False Creek area, being within the city limits, likely was considered as city property. The waterway question removed it from the city and seemed for a while to have put it with the federal crown.

15. B.C., Statutes, 1900, "Vancouver Harbour Lands Act," c.68.
foreshore to the city was authorized by the legislature. 16
This became D.L.2064 and extends westerly from D.L.2037 along the south shore to an extension of Ash street.

In 1911 the city obtained grants of this same area from the federal crown - a practice which was generally followed by grantees for the next 10 years until it was decided which crown was the rightful possessor of the False Creek bed and foreshore. 17

Power to Develop the Eastern Area.

Even with undisputed title to the bed at the east end of the Creek, however, the city was not yet in a position to undertake development. All the shore was privately held, and to the whole shoreline there were riparian rights. The city therefore again approached the provincial government and in 1904 the legislature passed the "False Creek Foreshore Act" 18 which gave to the city full authority to expropriate, with just compensation, "all lands, rights, littoral, riparian interests, rights of access to the waters of False Creek, or foreshore rights in, on, or contiguous to the foreshore and waters of all that portion of False Creek * * * east of Westminster avenue bridge * * * ."

16. B.C., Statutes, 1902, "Vancouver City Land Grant Act", c.68.
17. B.C., Dept. of Lands, File 153490.
18. B.C., Statutes, 1904, c.60.
This act was conditional upon the prior approval by Vancouver voters of a by-law setting forth the characteristics and financing of a development scheme for the D.L.2037, and the approval of the plan by the provincial executive council. It further provided that a plan had to be adopted before 1 January, 1907, and expropriations begun before 1 January 1908. No by-law was passed in the time provided, but interest did not diminish at the civic level, and the legislature renewed the act five times before the city abandoned its scheme for a shipping basin. While civic enthusiasm for the scheme often ran high, it was never quite high enough to influence three-fifths of the property-owning voters to vote the necessary money by-law to finance the project. What is most surprising, particularly in the light of tendencies today, is that no serious or substantial effort was made to have the project financed by the federal or provincial governments. Nor was the city in a position to grant sufficient land, or guarantee bonds, to have the work under-

19. In 1906 the city petitioned the legislature to extend the expiration date from 1907 to 1910. This was opposed by another petition claiming that "great damage will be done to the property owners, as the uncertainty as to whether or not the Corporation will ever proceed with the work depreciates the value of the property [subject to expropriation] and prevents sales being made and additional industries started upon the said lands * * * " (B.C., Legislative Assembly, Journal, 1906, p. 11.) It was signed by 20 individuals and 7 firms.

Again in 1909 much the same group petitioned to prevent a further extension of the time to comply with the provisions of the "False Creek Foreshore Act, 1904", "F.C.F.A. amendment Act", 1906, "F.C.F.A. Amendment Act", 1908, but were not heard and the act was amended again in 1909, 1910, and, for the last time, in 1911.
taken by a private business firm, as might have been the course of a senior government.

The city's first attempt to undertake a planned, long-term development for False Creek had failed, principally for lack of money. The property owners would not vote for the scheme, and it never became a project. It was a proposal for public improvement at public expense, and it contained no suggestions for an ordered development by public guidance and control of private action, which might have been done. Plans and zoning were still a quarter of a century away, however.

The questions may well be asked, what sort of plan and zoning would the city have adopted then if it had been so inclined? Would it have been as unrealistic in what it proposed as was the development advocated for the eastern tide-flats by the city council and city engineer?20 We cannot say, but in all probability a long-term capital development plan for False Creek would have been just as unrealistic as the optimistic, long-term thinking of the time.

20. The scheme is labelled 'unrealistic' for these reasons: The cost would have been very great, and the prospects, as we can see them now, for amortizing this debt, or even just carrying it, very slow in developing. Sufficient development of commercial water traffic to make the undertaking worth while would have put a great strain on the Main, Cambie and Granville street crossings and required them to be made high level at an early date. There was ample room in Burrard inlet for any development needed or foreseeable, and the development of which would not have required the dredging and filling which the False Creek project would have required.
2. Provincial Activities.

The independence of the city from appeals to senior governments for developmental assistance was due, in the case of the provincial government, in large measure to the well-nigh hopeless state of financial distress into which that government had sunk.

Judge Howay describes how, until Richard McBride for the first time in provincial politics went to the people in 1903 as the leader of a party (Conservative), "provincial governments were retained in power by the personal following of the premier and his cabinet". Between 1898 and 1903 the province had five ministries. Such policies as they had were largely concerned with the opening up of new areas of the province by grants of land to railways, and with the recriminations which usually followed such action. Along with weak government there was financial distress. The absence of the provincial government from False Creek affairs - and for that matter all of Vancouver - can be laid to the wretched state of provincial finances and politics before 1905.

Between Union in 1871 and the McBride budget of 1904 there was a balanced budget in only three years; between the incorporation of Vancouver and 1904 the provincial debt climbed from $1 million to $12.5 million.22

22. In the 5-year period 1898-1902 the per capita provincial
These heavy expenditures were not undertaken in Vancouver, however, nor did the provincial debt grow as a result of public works undertaken to benefit the city (or False Creek).\textsuperscript{23}

Between the time when the provincial (Smithe) government made the substantial grants of Vancouver - and False Creek - lands to the Canadian Pacific, and the when it made a strong effort, to bring the railway company to an accounting of the False Creek foreshores of these lands, the authorities in Victoria had little direct interest in or concern for the development of the waterway. The only major provincial actions were to give statutory clearance to plans which the city from time to time made for the development of the waterway and its basin, and an improper and ill-considered $300,000 deal with the Squamish Indians over the Kitsilano Indian reserve (see pp.65-6).

While the financial straits in which the provincial government found itself offer explanation enough for the inaction

expenditure in B.C. was $5.18, compared with from 42 to 80 cents in the other six provinces. Of this nearly $3 million was spent on roads. The costs of government operation - apart from public works - were $1 per capita compared with from 5 to 16 cents in other provinces. \textit{(Howay, op. cit.)}

23. The Fraser River bridge, begun in 1902 and completed two years later, at New Westminster, was a public undertaking of later advantage to Vancouver, for across it came the Great Northern and Canadian Northern railways when they built lines into Vancouver five and ten years later. The bridge cost a little over $1 million.
and it would be absurd to suggest that even more money should have been spent - in this case on False Creek - the government cannot be excused entirely from having defaulted on what must now be regarded as its legitimate responsibilities. False Creek was, by that time, in the heart of the fastest growing urban center in the province. In the light of the provincial government's self-acknowledged title to the bed and foreshore, it is only reasonable to assign to some of the responsibility for directing and assisting in the development of the waterway. The False Creek problem was, at least in part, a provincial one, if not in so far as the waterway was an obstacle to the city's residents, at least in so far as it was a waterway warranting economic development.

The Kitsilano Indian Reserve.

No example of confused governmental interaction better illustrates the complexity of False Creek administrative history than that concerning the Kitsilano Indian reserve (Squamish No.6), located on the south shore just inside the entrance to the waterway.

This was once the site of an Indian village of the Squamish band, and its inhabitants fished on the tidal mud-flats where

24. This acknowledgement is implicit in its legislation and grant in 1902 of the entire bed and foreshore in the area east of Carrall and Ash streets.
Granville island is today. With the rapid growth of Vancouver, or even before, this area was largely vacated by the Indians, and used only as a camping place by the residents of other reserves when they came to Vancouver. The existence of Indians there, if only from time to time, was a source of some irritation to the people nearby, and the existence of a large area, unoccupied and untaxed, was a little disturning to the city council. However, it never reached the point of being a public issue.

In 1911 the whole question of Indian reserves in B.C. became a matter of some dispute between the federal and B.C. governments. In 1913 a joint Royal Commission was appointed to examine the question of whether the amount of land in B.C. held in trust for the Indians was equitable to the Indians and the province? One of the properties subject to the Commission's investigation was the Kitsilano reserve.

At about the same time that the Commission was set up, the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific Railway is reported to have been considering establishing terminal facilities in Vancouver, and to have approached both members of the Squamish band and the federal government with an offer of $2 million for the Kitsilano property.

26. ibid, April 24, 1913, pp. 8475 and 8495.
27. ibid, April 24, p. 8480. 28. ibid, 26 May 1913, p. 10830.
From motives which are uncertain as to whether taken in the public or party interest, Attorney General Bowser, through a Mr. Alexander, made the Indians an offer of $225,000 for the property.29 This was much below the railway's offer, but the province insisted that it had a reversionary interest in the land, and therefore free title could not be exchanged between the Indians and the railway.30

Province Claims Reserve.

The agreement for sale was concluded between the province and the Indians31 and the province claimed title to the land as a result.

The whole action was very pleasing to the city, for it meant an end to the use of the reserve land by the Indians and promised a possible industrial development of the area, which would have been a welcome addition to the city's tax role, in those depressed years.


30. The propriety of this action is open to serious question, because the whole matter of the Indian reserves was then before the Royal Commission and it was contrary to the federal Indian Act to negotiate with anyone but the Indian Agency in the matter of Indian land. The province had earlier dealt directly with the Songhees Indians and obtained from them reserved land near Victoria by giving them other equivalent land in exchange, but this set no precedent for outright purchase. (Ibid, 24 April, p.8477)

31. A commission of $75,000 was received by a former clerk in the law offices of the Attorney General, which led to open questioning of the political propriety of the deal. (Ibid, 7 April, 1916, p.2682 and p.2685)
Payment to the Indians of the $225,000 ended the provincial action in the area, however. No deal was sought between the railway and the government, (possibly because the boom broke in 1913). All in all it was a hasty and foolish performance by the provincial government at best and, had it been taken to the courts, might very well have been found to be illegal. It marks, in a way, the nadir of provincial-federal relations over False Creek. In this case there was a jointly approved and appointed commission conducting hearings on the very matter in question, yet the provincial government ignored both the commission and the statutory obligations and directly negotiated an action of very dubious legality.

It is obvious today, but of course it may not have been realizable at the turn of the century, that the development of False Creek according to a comprehensive plan involving dredging and filling, with the creation of industrial land as the object, would have been an economically sound public effort, when compared with some of the railway ventures which won the approval of the legislature and governments at that time. There must, even in the early 1900's, have been some need for a channel dredged deeper and straighter than the natural one. The first decade of the twentieth century saw the establishment of a

32. Ibid, 24 April 1913, p. 8500.

33. Two to eight feet at low water. Canada, Dept. of Marine and Fisheries, Report on Vancouver Harbour, (by A.D. Swan), Ottawa, 1919, p.33.
number of industries there, and it is hard to understand why the dredging of a channel of adequate width, the erection of a bulkheaded channel wall, and the filling behind this with the dredged material was not even proposed by the provincial or city governments as a joint undertaking. The provincial foreshore grants to the city are evidence that the B.C. government accepted authority, and surely therefore responsibility, for the area.

The provincial government can properly be indicted for failing to plan and develop its holdings in False Creek.

3. Federal Government Action

After acceding to the demand of Vancouver city council in 1887 that the False Creek waterway be brought under the provisions of the Navigable Waters Protection Act, no further federal actions were taken affecting False Creek (except a crown grant of foreshore to the C.P.R. in 1894) in the nineties.

At the beginning of May, 1903, rumor of a political "deal" involving False Creek and the federal government circulated and the city council wrote to the federal government that:

Whereas it is understood that a lease has been applied for by certain parties of a portion of the bed of False Creek adjoining Granville Bridge **.  
Be it resolved that this Council on behalf of the City of Vancouver urgently protest against any portion of False.
Creek being alienated by lease or otherwise to any private individual or company, but urge that the same, being of great value to the commercial interests of Vancouver, should be retained and used for public purposes and be vested in the City of Vancouver. 34

Two men - Robert Kelly, described as "the undisputed Liberal boss", and Frank Burnett "a Liberal stalwart of the period" - had applied to the federal government for a crown grant to the foreshore area now largely occupied by Granville island. 35 They announced that they had been given a 99 year lease to some 29 acres of mud flats, that financing of the project had been arranged with a New York investment house and that

The plan is to have a semi-circular wharf running from about where the swing span of the first Granville bridge is, skirting the flat and back to the bridge towards the south side. We propose to have nineteen and a half acres [of some 60 available] under docks and wharves. We have agreed with the government to spend $125,000 *** within ten years.

The agreement called for payment of $100 per annum advancing to $500 per annum. 36

Popular Opposition

There was considerable opposition to the government's action, and the Vancouver Board of Trade went on record as "strongly endorsing the telegram of the City Council protesting

34. Vancouver Province, 4 May, 1903, p.4.
35. Roy, Brown, personal interview with author, 14 Feb, 1953. See also Brown, Vancouver Sun, 18 May, 1951, p.5.
against the alienation by lease or otherwise of any portion of False Creek".\textsuperscript{37} The \textit{Province} newspaper spoke out editorially in favor of the project saying that

If the people's rights and interests are properly protected, and if a large amount of money is to be expended on lands which otherwise would be ugly and idle for many years to come, the arrangement would seem to be a good one for Vancouver.\textsuperscript{38}

But feeling against the proposal, possibly because of the close connection between the promoters and the political party in power, was strong enough for the government to reverse its action (which had been announced only by Kelly and Burnett, never by the Cabinet). In a letter to the city council from Sir Wilfred Laurier assured the city administration that no action had been taken to dispose of the bed and foreshore of the False Creek waterway.\textsuperscript{39}

In 1904, in an apparent reversal of this stand, the federal government embarked upon a policy of liberally granting False Creek foreshore lots to private individuals and firms, although this time the land was all adjacent to the shore west of Westminster avenue (Main street). The grants were made to owners of the narrow upland lots between Westminster avenue and the water, and allowed the businesses to expand their cramped sites. In this the action was in harmony with the expressed policy of the city's Board of Works which had expressed itself as favor-

\textsuperscript{37} Ibid, 6 May, p.2  \textsuperscript{38} Ibid, 7 May, p.6.

\textsuperscript{39} Ibid, 20 May, p.1.
ing the granting of foreshore property "for the establishment of industrial works." Seventeen separate grants were made by the Laurier government between 1904 and its defeat in 1911, all of them in D.L.2037 which had previously been granted to the city by the provincial government. In 1914 and 1915 an additional four grants were made by the Borden government to private firms and two to the city. After that there was no further alienation of foreshore or bed.

Two important conditions resulted from this disposal of the foreshore to the private interests. Businesses were then able to extend their property by filling, and this many of them did. The strip of land between Main street and the high water line was narrow and inadequate for the growth which many of the businesses experienced. The foreshore grant at the same time gave to these property owners a more certain claim to riparian rights which would enable them more firmly to resist (than they might perhaps otherwise have done) any development of False Creek likely to affect their own interests, and to claim financial recompense in the event that such development was undertaken.

Development Not Aided

Had there then been a scheme for developing the False

Creek waterway, or even the east end, these grants could have been made conditional upon observance of the plan. As it was, the property owners extended their property or built wharves into the waterway in any manner they chose and without concern for the overall advantages or disadvantages which such might have. As things turned out, however, the projects were not so large, or the aims so different, that development was seriously impaired or misdirected.

The rights of the property to water access,⁴² and the foreshore installations did necessitate the retention of the narrow channel which runs north as far as Keefer street at the east end. Without private ownership of the waterlots in front of the Main street properties this might have been filled in and occupied, perhaps, by the Great Northern when it originally crossed the Creek to its first station on Pender street. This channel is a legacy of that early development, and an unfortunate one. It was never had a substantial use and in 1952 was only a mooring basin for fish boats. By its actions in making crown grants of False Creek foreshore, however, the federal government assumed ownership, and hence responsibility, and that role it failed to fulfill. The criticism which can be

⁴². For comments on riparian (and other) rights in False Creek see: Champion & White v. City of Vancouver (1916) 23 B.C.R. 221; Odlum et al. v. City of Vancouver (1914) 85 L.J.P.C. 95; In re False Creek Reclamation Act (1915) 20 B.C.R. 453.
levelled against it is that either it should not have made any foreshore grants at all or, in making them, it should have acted in accordance with a plan for foreshore and channel development, which responsibility could not properly be separated from the right to make crown grants. Thus added to the administrative confusion and failed to undertake desirable development.

The defeat of the Laurier government in 1911 and the formation of the Vancouver Harbour Commission in 1913 settled the matter of private development of the foreshore — at least by the Liberals.

False Creek Survey.

The prosperity of the Vancouver harbour activities prompted the federal government to order a survey of False Creek to determine its suitability for development. The report was favorable and indicated that the dredging of the waterway to a depth suitable for medium draft vessels such as were used in the coastal trade was physically and financially feasible.43 No action was undertaken, however.

In 1912 the new Conservative government sent A.D. Swan, an engineer, to

"* * * examine and report on the general conditions and to make such recommendations for the future development of the Port of Vancouver as seemed to him most suitable to promote its growth* * *".

Among the Swan recommendations was

that False Creek * * * should be dredged to a depth of about 20 feet at low water and used for coast-wise traffic, and that the upper end of False Creek, extending to about 300 acres, which was then dry at low water and covered with a few feet of water at high tide, should be entirely filled with the material dredged from False Creek and the land so reclaimed used as a great central railway terminal to which all the railways entering Vancouver should have access; * * *.44

In 1913 the government began implementation of the Swan recommendations. A Vancouver Harbour Commission, which he had urged, was appointed, and the Public Works Department began a major undertaking in False Creek with

"* * * for its object the utilizing, as an additional harbour to that of Burrard inlet, [the False Creek] basin of tidal water running from English bay to the centre of the city. This work necessitated the deepening of a channel, some 13,500 feet long, 350 feet wide and 20 feet deep at low water, from English bay to the Great Northern Railway bridge crossing False Creek, together with a dredged cut, some 2,400 feet long and having an average width of 188 feet * * * running northerly from the inner end of the main channel and having a depth of 12 feet below low water.45

This work was completed in 1916 at a cost of $595,000.46

The dredging operation removed 4.3 million cubic yards and

---

44. Swan, A.D.R. "Vancouver Harbour," Selected ... papers, ICE, 1925, pp. 4-6.
46. Ibid., 1916, p.714; 1917, p.141.
this material was deposited on the east end mud flats to provide a major part of the reclamation of the area. In addition, a 32-acre area was bulkheaded on the flats just inside the entrance of the waterway, beneath the newly-built Granville bridge, and this was also filled to create Granville (Industrial) island.

**Similar Administrative Actions.**

Here was a plan for development and the implementation of it; it affected an area already planned (although not too precisely) by another level of government, and by good fortune, rather than negotiation and agreement, the two ideas coincided. The city had given up its idea of a shipping basin at the head of the waterway and turned to the development of a railway terminal; at the same time the federal government determined to fill in the area with the same purpose in mind. For once planning at the administrative level preceded private enterprise, at least in so far as the total area was concerned (the Great Northern had already begun developing the property ringing the shore which it had obtained from the city).

Despite this coincidence of projects, and undertakings to implement them, there was no joint effort made to plan the use to be made of the area created, other than to encourage its development by the railroads. The channel was dredged, but no provision was made for control or regulation of its shores.
Granville island was created only because the distance was too great to pump the dredged material all the way back to Main street, because there were useless mud flats handy, and it seemed a good idea. Granville island was not a part of the original Swan proposal, and its north shore distorted the channel he had proposed.

Thus the first substantial public undertaking was done in an unplanned way and with little consideration given to the development, at the same time, of the False Creek shores. The opportunity existed, the war had not yet begun, and there seemed to be, for the first time, a valid comprehension of what role the False Creek waterway might play in the port of Vancouver and in the general civic economy.

4. Summary of Administrative and Political Developments.

The land boom, the rapid increase in population, and the commercial and industrial growth in the two decades at the turn of the century produced an optimism which influenced administrative and political thinking. The city council enthusiastically rode the crest of the prosperity wave associated with the land boom and rapid growth. The provincial government by this time had passed from a slough of financial despond to the stability
and prosperity which came with the McBride government, and at
the federal level the Laurier administration had a prosperous
buoyancy which was felt by local Liberals.

These three influences were reflected in the False Creek
waterway. While the city council's ideas for the over-ambitious
shipping basin east of Main could not gain enough support
from the property owners in the form of a money by-law
to implement the scheme, the ownership which the city had of
the bed and foreshore allowed it to negotiate profitably with
the two railways seeking entrance into the booming city. Thus,
financial while the province gave it no help, either in works undertaken
or grants-in-aid of False Creek development, the willingness of
the Legislature to turn over to the city areas of the bed and
foreshore must not be minimized.47

The matter of paramountcy, as between the federal and
provincial crowns, was confused at that time, if not to the two
senior governments, at least to anyone else who had to deal with
the question. While the city had been granted D.L.2037 (all
the bed and foreshore of False Creek lying easterly of the

47. The city's hopes for substantial development of the
False Creek waterway may again depend, in part, on the
provincial willingness to make further crown grants of
bed and foreshore. There is this difference, however,
between the present and half a century ago. From the
provincial crown holdings in False Creek the government
in Victoria now derives revenue from rents, at no cost
or administrative trouble to itself. In 1902 the bed
and foreshore were entirely unproductive of revenue.
projection south of the west boundary of Carrall street\textsuperscript{a}),
the federal government between 1904 and 1915 crown-granted
foreshore parcels to owners of the upland lots on the Main
street line, and these foreshore lots were registered with
the provincial Land Registry Office as parcels of D.L.2037.\textsuperscript{48}

The change in party brought a change in the type of activ­
ity by the federal government, and while the dredging was of
greater public benefit than the granting of foreshore, neither
action was made a part of any developmental scheme or undertaken
in agreement with the city authorities.

\textsuperscript{48.} Among these federal grants were two to the City of
Vancouver - parcels 14 and 33 of D.L.2037. Parcel 14
and the upland lot adjacent is the city's Union street
yard; parcel 33 the site of the city's Main street
docks (opposite First Avenue).
Chapter Five

The Turn of the Century II, 1896-1916

Consult the annals of Canada for the past 50 years at random and, whatever party may be in power, what do we find? The government is building a railway, buying a railway, selling a railway, or blocking a railway. Transportation, indeed, possessed great constitutional significance.\(^1\)

No party took national office without a firm railway plank and some fell from power because of public indignation over the methods chosen to implement it. But this 'railroad nationalism' was not exclusive to Ottawa. In the preceding sections it was shown that the B.C. government could participate in it too, and a municipality such as Vancouver was not free from the influence.

The first city council of Vancouver, before it had been in office a full term, had offered the Canadian Pacific a 30-year tax abatement in return for locating the terminal yards closer to the city center than was originally planned. As the city grew, so did its interests in transportation, for at that time railways and steamship lines were believed to carry the seed of business prosperity and industrial growth. Railroads

---

were the embodiment of sought-for economic well-being, and when railways were combined with ocean shipping, ideas (which sometimes later became delusions) of grandeur made the citizen of every seaport imagine his town to be on the threshold of becoming a great ocean terminal. Such was the idea of Vancouver, and its city council, in the decades immediately before and after the turn of the century.

1. The Second Railway Development.

The Great Northern Railway was much attracted by the growth that was taking place in Canada, and it became the company's policy to push branch lines north into Canada wherever they were feasible. Vancouver's rapid development made the city a desirable area of expansion for the Great Northern, and in 1903 the Great Northern approached the city council for rights which would allow it to enter Vancouver.

The desire of the Great Northern was strong and it pressed the council for an agreement. The railway wanted a downtown

2. Competition was another factor, for in 1890, with the construction by the C.P.R. of a railway bridge across the Fraser at Mission and a branch line to the American town of Sumas, a joint service into Vancouver was inaugurated with the Northern Pacific. Cars of the latter company from the east and Seattle were operated to and from Vancouver over the C.P.R. line. (Thompson and Edgar, ibid., p.180) This joint service was discontinued in 1917 (ibid., p.343).
terminal and proposed to reach it by way of False Creek. For this portion of its right-of-way it would need a grant from the city of land which the latter had received from the provincial government (D.L.2037).

Negotiations were protracted, with proposals and counter-proposals made by each side. The railway offered, among other things, to build a spur line westward to Cambie street from where it intended to cross the Creek. This was to give railway access to the section of the south shore recently received by the city from the provincial government.

The Great Northern Enters the City.

In 1908 the railway and the city reached agreement, and in the same year the Great Northern acquired, through the New Westminster Southern Railway (which it owned) the original charter of the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Co., in whose name its Vancouver properties are held. The railway was extended from New Westminster, a swing-span bridge was built 700 feet west of Main street, and a terminal was built on Pender street. The first train from Seattle entered the city in 1909.

3. It proposed to enter Vancouver by way of the Brunette, Burnaby lake, and Still Creek valley after crossing the newly-erected (1904) Fraser River bridge at New Westminster. This would mean crossing the Grandview ridge, skirting the south shore of the Creek to a point a short distance west of Westminster avenue (Main street), where it would cross by a bridge to its terminal on Pender street (then Dupont) just east of Carrall.
In the same year there occurred an event which was soon to heighten for a while the civic ideas for large-scale development at the east end of False Creek, not as a dredged and deepened ship basin, but rather as a large railway terminal and industrial area, either with or without dock facilities.

The Great Northern was in a period of expansion, and saw a bright future for the eastern tidal area of False Creek. It began to acquire title to all False Creek shore property it could purchase. Its activities were kept well concealed in the beginning, but word eventually leaked out and prices climbed to a reported $100 per foot of shore frontage for the last few parcels.

By 1910 the Great Northern owned virtually all the False Creek shore east of Main street. Whatever its value for future reclamation and development, it now had a great immediate value to the company in bargaining with the city. The waterway was legally navigable and the property had riparian rights which were certain to be affected by any development of the east end which the city might undertake. The city council, it will be

4. In Seattle, meanwhile, the railways there were scrambling for ownership of the harbour tidelands. Control meant ample room for expansion and development, which could bring profitable traffic to the rail lines. In these dealings the Great Northern became a "tide-flat specialist", and it saw much to be gained by control of the False Creek flats. (Roy Brown, personal interview with author, 14 Feb. 1953)

5. The company acted through William Holden, a Vancouver real estate man, whose business prospered along with that of the railway line. (Roy Brown, ibid.)

remembered, was still thinking in terms of a shipping basin in the area.

**East End Development.**

In May, 1910, the council and the Great Northern entered into an agreement whereby the city gave the railway a strip of foreshore around the whole east end of the Creek, retaining for itself a horseshoe-shaped central portion about 160 acres in area. In return the railway company's claims to riparian rights in the area were extinguished, and it agreed to build a new station (the one it occupies today) on the new land it acquired. 7

This arrangement cannot be considered as a part of any plan of the city for development. It was a modification of, but did not obliterate, the lingering scheme for a shipping basin in the area. The city had to surrender a strip of land of great potential value, whether or not the ship basin materialized, as a quid pro quo for being permitted to extinguish the riparian rights to the shore property. These the property enjoyed through earlier action of the city which had not been well thought out or carefully taken. Again it was a case of unsound planning being done on an unsound premise and not being well, if at all, related to the city's real needs or the problems

7. The station and terminal at Pender street were already overtaxed by passenger and freight traffic, and could not be expanded on the property available to the railway.
of the time. If the actions were modified at all by glances into the future, these were quick and careless, the objects misshapen or obscured by the easy optimism and confidence in the growth panacea.

Nor was it a matter of squarely facing the challenge arising from the False Creek problem. The area was valuable, yet the city was concerning itself only with the part least valuable and most difficult to develop. True, it was meeting the challenge in a way, but in the least straightforward way. The action did not really help at all that part of the dual problem which required that economic development of the waterway be undertaken or encouraged. While aware of the problem, the city met the challenge in an obscure and (eventually) fruitless way.

The Canadian Northern Negotiates.

All through its dealings with the Great Northern the city council cherished the idea of the False Creek shipping basin, and for that purpose retained the center part of the area. Enthusiasm for the scheme was waning, however, and when the city was approached by the Canadian Northern with a proposal to develop the center portion of the horseshoe area as a terminal for that railroad, the city was willing to negotiate and eventually to sign an agreement.8

8. The Canadian Northern had first planned its terminus at Port Mann on the Fraser, south of New Westminster. The focus of activity on the Burrard peninsula influenced it to attempt a location nearer the port city.
This agreement between the city and the railway, signed in 1913—less than 30 years after the agreement between the provincial government and the Canadian Pacific, which brought the latter into Vancouver,—indicates better than any single thing the differences which growth had made to the Vancouver area. The later agreement is the very antithesis of the early one. In 1913 the city asked all and gave a very minimum (113 acres) in exchange; in 1885 the railway made the demands and had them acceded to in considerable measure (6,000 acres, a 30-year tax exemption, among others). Of the many conditions to which the Canadian Northern agreed, the following directly affected False Creek:

- keep the site as the railway's principal western terminus for all time,
- pay cost of extinguishing riparian rights on nineteen Main street lots,
- fill in the bed of the Creek east of Main street, starting in ninety days,
- build a $4 million union passenger terminal,
- build a tunnel where the Grandview cut now is,
- build a retaining wall on the new easternmost shore of the Creek,
- "make, grade, pave and maintain" certain city streets on the property conveyed to the railway,
- allow the city to erect certain roadway bridges across the terminal area, and to bear certain costs of the First Avenue viaduct approaches,
- lease for manufacturing purposes such of the conveyed property as was not used for railway purposes.\(^9\)

It was estimated at the time that the cost\(^10\) of filling would be $1,408,000 for the part east of Main street, and $239,000 for the channel beneath the Main street bridge and the small area immediately west of it.\(^10\)

---

10. Ibid., p.239.
The city's two agreements with the railways were confirmed by the provincial legislature, in 1911 and 1913.11

The Canadian Pacific and Lulu Island Railways.

Once the Canadian Pacific had its trestle built, its track laid to Kitsilano, and its yards and shops located on the north shore of False Creek, it settled down to a period of steady but gradual expansion.11.12 As traffic increased, the yards and the freight terminal at the foot of Abbott street were gradually enlarged. To allow for some of this growth, and as a general long-term policy, this shore was slowly extended, first by filling the indentations, and later by pushing it out over the shallow flats. Growth of the port and the city continually increased the demand for freight and passenger services, and facilities were kept growing to meet this.

Only one major capital expansion was undertaken by the railway during this time. In 1902 the Vancouver and Lulu Island Railway - a wholly-owned C.P.R. subsidiary - was built from the Kitsilano trestle to Steveston,12 with a branch line

11. B.C., Statutes, "False Creek Confirmatory Act", 1911, c.55; "False Creek Terminals Act", 1913, c.76.

12. Because the Great Northern got a right-of-way from Ladner to near Chilliwack (as well as from Blaine to New Westminster) when it bought the chartered but never operated New Westminster Southern and Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway Companies, and because it operated a line to Ladner long enough for it to appear as if a major terminal might develop at the mouth of the Fraser, the C.P.R. built its line to meet a competitive threat which never materialized. The G.N. Ladner line has been abandoned for a good many years now.
running along the south shore of False Creek as far as Cambie street - the eastern boundary of the company-owned D.L.526.

In 1905 the V. & L.I. was leased by the C.P.R. to the B.C. Electric Railway, which electrified it and ran both freight and interurban passenger trains over it. It has been operated by the B.C. Electric ever since. The residential development in the Kitsilano area also caused the street railway company to run a street car line over the trestle to that area. Thus the trestle, originally intended to take C.P.R. freight and passenger trains to a station, terminals and docks on the Kitsilano point, was finally put into use as a street car and interurban line, of which the latter did some freight switching.\textsuperscript{13}

The spur along the south shore served the Hanbury mill at the foot of Granville and the Vancouver Lumber mill at the foot of Cambie. Rail service was now an inducement for other businesses to enter the area, and they soon did. The C.P.R. leased its shore property, but did not sell any, and was thus able to maintain a control over the tenants and, indirectly, over the freight potential of such occupants.

When the Great Northern built its spur line west from its

\textsuperscript{13} Previous to building the V. & L.I., the C.P.R. had left the trestle with an unspanned opening in it, to comply with the requirements of the Navigable Waters Protection Act. With the construction of the Lulu Island line the trestle was rebuilt of Australian gumwood (to resist the teredos) with a swing and a fixed span. It stands today as it was rebuilt.
False Creek crossing, an interchange was arranged and built between the two lines, just east of Cambie bridge. This completed the rail ring around the waterway, and gave south shore property access to two (and later a third, the C.N.R.) railways for movement of freight. The industrial growth of the south shore which then began has continued in a steady development ever since.

**False Creek Railway Ring Completed.**

The completion of the railroad ring, a non-administrative achievement, was a major step towards meeting the problem of economic development of the False Creek basin. But it was not without creating some problems of its own. The C.P.R. line to its yards (and originally on to Kitsilano) crossed the narrow neck of the Granville peninsula, and all street traffic from the east into the area (which soon became Vancouver's downtown and grew rapidly) had to cross it. This meant a level crossing at Powell, Cordova, Hastings and Pender streets, and no alternative way around. As train traffic to the yards and the freight terminal increased, and as the city grew in size and activity, this was an ever-increasing problem, to which no thought had been given in laying out the down-town street plan or in developing the down-town area.\(^{14}\) A similar crossing existed at Main street

---

\(^{14}\) This traffic problem eventually became so intolerable that the city and the railway came to an agreement whereby the level crossing was replaced by a tunnel under the city center, providing an alternate connection between the Burrard inlet lines and the False Creek yards.
near First avenue, by the Great Northern, and all passenger and freight traffic crossed there.15 The Vancouver and Lulu Island line also was built across Fourth avenue, at grade. (Traffic on both the rail line and the road have never been great enough to bother each other. More of a problem, but still not acute, is that of the crossing of what is now Burrard, where traffic became significant only after the opening of the Burrard street bridge.)

The residents of the Fairview heights above False Creek and east of Granville were distressed by the south shore industrial development. This area had attracted, after the opening of the Granville bridge and the Broadway belt-line trolley-car, a very high grade of residential home, and gave promise of becoming a well-to-do neighbourhood. The industrial development of False Creek brought that to an end, however. Perhaps a development plan of the city, had there been one, would have indicated the intention of industrial development in False Creek, or perhaps even have prevented it in that section. At any rate a land use plan for the area could have cautioned those families who settled there in substantial homes, soon to find the area made undesirable.

15. This traffic was much reduced when the new Great Northern station was built at its present site. There is still crossing by freight trains, but these are switched only in the late and early hours.
Railways as 'Development Plans'.

The False Creek railways point up the very important fact that the building of a rail line - even a branch or spur - and the location chosen for it, can and does have a substantial influence on subsequent land use and development, often far beyond the plans and hopes of the people putting down the track.

The two major industrial and development influences in the False Creek basin have been water and rail access. By far the majority of enterprises in the area are there because of one or both of these facilities. So it was that the presence of the rail line brought development to certain locations, while an absence hindered it in others. Between Cambie and Main streets the rail lines were located on what was, when they were built, the shore (it has since been extended by filling), without provision for extended spur trackage. This meant that the area between the waterfront and Sixth avenue has, on the one hand, been blighted by the industry on the shore without, on the other, being able to share to any great extent in the industrial growth which would have been possible if there had been fewer streets and more spur tracks. The same blight and slow development is also found in the area bounded by Granville, Sixth and Burrard.

While capital investment in a rail line branch is not small, the permanence of the line is out of all proportion to its physical substance. It compares, in its permanent influence on development, with a bridge or a land fill.
The absence of any planned association between street pattern and rail facilities which would allow for the expansion of the latter with industrial growth, has given the False Creek area two small sections of blighted residential use which, with rail facilities and a less rigid street grid, would be of high industrial value. Had there been a realization then of the future needs by industry of rail and road facilities, or even a less severe application of the road pattern in the vicinity of industrial sidings, there would have been possible a more orderly industrial development, and a better over-all industrial area, than has occurred. A deliberate administrative planning of railway development in the False Creek (and other) areas, coupled with a correlated street pattern, could have produced an industrial development wider than what has occurred, and avoided two areas of blighted undevelopment.

2. Industrial Development

In 1885, when the C.P.R. was granted D.L. 526, the Hastings Mill timber lease of the area south of False Creek and English bay was permitted to expire, and most logging activity on False

16. The fact that they are also subdivided into very small parcels, many of which are individually held and occupied, has been a serious hinderance to development of the areas.

17. It is the policy of the city government to resist any railway spur construction which uses or crosses existing city streets. The constricting nature of this, and the
Creek ceased for the time being. But the demand for lumber continued to increase, and the most suitable and available sites for saw mills on Burrard inlet were filled. False Creek, by this time, because of its protected waterway, its large mud flat suitable for booming grounds, and its increased rail facilities after 1905, became increasingly desirable for mill sites.

Following the construction of the railway trestle across the mouth of the waterway in 1887, it was at first impossible for water craft to enter False Creek, but with the bringing of the creek under provisions of the Navigable Waters Protection Act, a gap was opened in the trestle (which was not then being used by the railway) and it once more became possible to operate mills with timber cut outside of the immediate False Creek area.

Lumber Mills and Other Early Industries.

The Royal City Planing Mill, built the year before the trestle, was the largest of the first mills on False Creek. It occupied about 1,000 feet of shore where Abbott and Carrall streets then reached it (the B.C. Electric freight yards now occupy the site, which was subsequently extended by filling). At this location it had access to the C.P.R. where the latter crossed the isthmus from the harbour shore to False Creek. This operation was consolidated in 1903 with the Hastings Mill, and became known as the B.C. Mill, Timber and Trading Co. The Hanbury's were interested in the new enterprise, and when the
C.P.R. extended its yard location on the False Creek North Shore, the B.C.M.T. & T. Co. mill was moved to the south shore just east of Granville street, where it was known as the Hanbury mill.18 Other early mills which were already established at the time the city was incorporated were MacKay's mill at the north end of what is now Granville bridge - this became the Robertson and Hackett mill in 1899 and has been in continuous operation until recent months - and Leamy & Kyles mill at the south end of what is now Cambie bridge - this became the Vancouver Lumber Company.19

The Rat Portage Lumber Company began operations in 1890 on the south shore at the foot of Granville, immediately east of the bridge. It is at the same site today, under the name of Giroday Sawmills.18

Diversification Begins.

Three years after the city's incorporation the forerunner of another class of industry, which has since become important in False Creek, was established. The sand, gravel and building supply firm of Champion and White was set up near the Royal City

18. It should be borne in mind that Granville island was not in existence at that time. The mud flats, which were filled to create it, provided excellent booming grounds.

mill. In 1910 it purchased from Armstrong and Morrison, a construction firm, the site it occupies today, which was then the southernmost holding and dock on the spit which formed the central narrows and which carried Westminster avenue (now Main) to the bridge. In 1890 the McDonald construction firm located across the bridge on the south shore (it is there today as the firm of J.A. & C.H. McDonald, suppliers of building stone).

Industrial diversification had already begun, for in the same year there opened the Wallace shipyard at the foot of Granville, west of the new bridge. From its ways came chiefly fish boats for the new and expanding industry. This establishment was the forerunner of the large Burrard shipyard located today in North Vancouver.

Development continued and scattered all around the shore of False Creek. By 1900 there were, in addition to the firms already mentioned, the Vancouver Engineering Works, just started near the Vancouver Lumber Mill, and the Cambie bridge, and the McKenzie Brothers wharf on the south spit of the center narrows (now Main street).

On Westminster avenue (Main street) there were, besides those mentioned above, a machine shop, two wharves doing a general shipping and transfer business, the gas and the steam electric plant (not then joined as the B.C. Electric Company), and several small businesses and shops.
Between Main street and the Royal City Mill there were, besides Champion and White, several more small businesses and stores. Along the north shore there was a large cement plant on land now filled in and under the Georgia viaduct. At the Cambie bridge there was a cooperage and a shingle mill. The C.P.R. yards took up most of the area between Cambie and Granville bridge (as is the case today), but at the foot of Granville there were the firms already mentioned.

The Land Boom.

The first real land boom of Vancouver as a city (there had, of course, been the boom of the railway's coming) began about five or six years after the turn of the century, and by that time the city was large enough for False Creek to feel the full impact. Hastings and Carrall streets had long been the heart of the city, but the growth spread out from Hastings along Westminster avenue, across the False Creek bridge, and into Mount Pleasant, along Granville again over False Creek, and into Fairview. Meanwhile the rail spurs along the south shore of False Creek had been completed by the Canadian Pacific and Great Northern, which meant the adding to shore properties of all the advantages of access to markets by rail.

20. The Hall building at Main and Broadway is the high water mark of that wave in that direction, from which point there was a considerable ebb.
Because a land boom is associated with a local prosperity, the first effects on the False Creek area were felt on Westminster avenue - which became Main street as a result of the new activity there. The developments that occurred were chiefly commercial, and therefore could take advantage of the one section of the shore without trackage, which was more than offset by a combination of frontage on the water and on Main street. As has been mentioned, the building supply firm of Champion and White was among the first to establish there. Between 1900 and 1914 seventeen other firms, including the Vancouver Gas Company (later taken over by the B.C. Electric), the B.C. Electric, Marpole and MacDonald Coal (still there as part of Evans Coleman), Armstrong and Morrison, contractors, and others whose businesses chiefly supplied building equipment and materials, established on Main street.

The land boom of the early 1900's collapsed in 1913, but its effects on the city and False Creek were substantial, and recession or deflated land prices could not wipe them out. The population had reached 100,000, and there had been a commensurate business and commercial expansion.

In False Creek the south shore between Cambie and Granville gained three more lumber and shingle mills, as well as a machinery depot and one or two other small undertakings using the rail and water access. Agreements had been reached and confirmed closing off all the water area east of Main street,
and the flats at Carrall and Abbott street were filled out to a line approximate with the projection of Georgia street (except for the narrow channel west of Main street).
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Chapter Six.
The War Years, 1913 - 1922.

There is no one point of time, during this period before and during the first World War, which provides a sharp and convenient break in the affairs of False Creek (as there was in those of the city, the country and the world). Both the change in federal government in 1911 and the depression of 1913 had perceptible but not substantial immediate effects on the waterway or its affairs. Much the same can be said about the war, which had an impact on False Creek, but not until 1917 was it an immediate one.

The city itself came very definitely to the end of an era in the years immediately before the war, but the evidence of this is not found in False Creek.

Taking one's stand at 1911 and looking back over the first 25 years it is possible to see a certain pattern in Vancouver's development. The city amid the stumps of 1886 has already become the metropolis of British Columbia. It was in 1911 an over-grown boom town, full of real estate speculators and company promoters but it had now struck its roots deep into the soil.

It was a time when men might have taken stock of what had gone before, and planned for what lay ahead. If

they did so, it was not through any agency of government, and their ideas were not recorded in public action. The rapid pace of growth and expansion had slowed; there was time to consider the benefits as well as the evils of unregulated development, but it was not done. Perhaps there were still too many of what Professor Sage refers to as the "speculators and promoters" for plans to be made for anything but individual advantage and what, in more recent times, has come to be called the "fast buck".

At the same time, insofar as men were concerned with False Creek, they could certainly feel that they had met head-on the challenge of its two-fold problem. Had not one third of the area of the waterway been reclaimed? Were not the tide flats eliminated as a useless and unpleasant obstacle and replaced with an area of great potential value for industrial development? Was there not a straight, deep channel where before there had been one of uncertain depth and course?

Any criticism must be less of what was achieved than of how it was done and what it might have been in a more favorable political and administrative climate. For the first time the three levels of government had come to grips with the same problem at roughly the same time. But they did not do so together. It was coincidence or accident that, all in the same period, the city abandoned its plan for a shipping basin, the Canadian Northern Railway was able to make an agreement with the
city to acquire the area for railway and general development, and the federal government decided to make the navigable waterway more navigable through dredging.

It was at this time that the federal government set up a statutory body which for a time gave promise of playing a coordinating role in the administrative confusion affecting False Creek. That this body failed to fulfill such a promise — a promise not implicit in its creation, it must be said — was less the fault of its own good intentions than of the ebb and flow of party fortunes in federal politics.

1. The Vancouver Harbour Commission.

The construction of the Panama Canal brought increased attention to the port of Vancouver, with the result that in 1913 a three-man body was appointed by the federal government to conduct the business and affairs of the Vancouver harbour in a manner similar to that already established for Montreal and Quebec. The area of its authority was set as east of a line drawn between Points Atkinson and Grey, and it was therefore considered, in the beginning, to be responsible for the harbour and associated functions in English Bay, Burrard inlet, and False Creek.

2. Canada, Statutes, 1913, "The Vancouver Harbour Commisseners Act", c.54.
3. Ibid., ss. 4 and 11.
This body at once undertook a positive development policy, in line with the 1912 report of A.D. Swan, which recommended for the False Creek area, besides the dredging operation already described, that:

A line of wharves should be constructed to a harbour headline at the dredged channel; 
The area between these wharves and the original shore should be filled in and reclaimed with the dredged material; thereby creating "very valuable *** sites for new industries [and improving] the existing industries, and "Large areas [should] be provided for railway terminals and other transportation facilities right in the centre of the city."

First Action.

The dredging of False Creek in 1913 was the action of the federal Public Works Department. It was the intention of the harbour commission to complete the work of bulk-heading and back-filling according to the Swan plan. In this proposal the commission had the support of H.H. Stevens, M.P. for Vancouver, who in 1916 sought (but did not gain until 1919) parliamentary approval for a federally guaranteed $5 million harbour commission bond issue for undertakings in Vancouver harbour, (which then included False Creek). These included acquisition of the Kitsilano Indian reserve and a right-of-way for a terminal railway from Glen drive to the reserve.

---

5. See page 73.
6. Canada, Dept., of Marine and Fisheries, ibid., p. 33
During this same period the negotiations begun in 1913 by the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific Railroad (see page 63) were privately continued with the Indian Affairs branch and the harbour commission, H.H.Stevens acting for the latter as well as informally for the federal government. An agreement was signed between the three parties in 1917, but before it was announced operation of the United States Railroads was taken over by the U.S. government (26 December, 1917). This put the railway's plan in abeyance for the time being, and when it was returned to private operation it was not in a strong enough financial position to undertake the expansion.

Post War Proposals.

In 1918 the federal government commissioned A.D.Swan, Montreal engineer, again to carry out a survey of Vancouver harbour, and his report was made to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in January, 1919.

Although the mud flats east of Main had been reclaimed and the False Creek channel dredged in accordance with his earlier recommendations, no action had been taken on the foreshore development. This last was not again included in his recommendations, however, probably because private development was achieving much the same ends. Instead, Swan took up the

Milwaukee Road's scheme and recommended that the Kitsilano peninsula be considered as an alternative site to Burrard inlet for development of deep-sea docks. He estimated a total cost for this of $18.75 million, considerably less than his estimate for similar facilities in Burrard inlet. The area needed for the docks and terminals would have been about 140 acres, half of which would have been provided by the Indian reserve. The development, he felt, should be a progressive one:

I show on the plans at Kitsilano accommodation for 21 steamers, but I do not suggest for a moment that all this accommodation should be provided now, as the general scheme permits of construction in units, and if this site is finally approved I suggest that the shore quay which is 2,700 feet long and the first small pier would be ample to commence with. Taking the proportionate rate for the whole scheme this would provide six berths at an approximate cost of $4,500,000 complete, including land.

The shore quay at the mouth of False Creek is, without doubt, much the cheapest site where deep water accommodation can be provided, with the least possible delay.

[The C.N.R.] suggest False Creek as being the most advantageous location for docking facilities for passengers and other traffic. I have therefore, shown berth-age accommodation on Granville island.

As an alternative to this site I suggest good accommodation could be provided at the head of False Creek, adjoining Main street.

I recommend the removal of present Canadian Pacific Railway bridge across False Creek.

Five Million for Development.

In the spring of 1919 the federal government, after consulting with the harbour commissioners, announced its intention...
tention to aid the development along the general lines set out by the Swan report. Response in Vancouver, while favourable to the expansion of port facilities, was divided between support for Burrard inlet or False Creek for the site of the new piers. Harbour and shipping, a trade journal devoted to Pacific coast marine affairs, in its May, 1919 issue (p. 203) reported:

The *** intention of the Government [is] to proceed immediately with a Money Bill, appropriating $5 million as a loan to the Vancouver Harbour Commission for the purpose of initiating construction of the development schemes advocated by Mr. [A.D.] Swan.***

The determination, therefore, has been taken to favour the Kitsilano scheme in preference to Burrard inlet, which is, in the opinion of most shipping men in the port [of Vancouver], the logical site for harbour development.

A bill to authorize the federal government to loan the Vancouver Harbour Commission $5 million was approved by the Commons in June, 1919.¹² There was no stipulation of how the money was to be spent but prior approval by the Governor-in-Council was required before any work was to be undertaken. The main purpose of this loan was to provide for the construction of deep-sea wharves. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (C.C.Ballantyne) gave some indication of the lack of agreement on where these should be built when he said, in committee:

*** there is considerable difference of opinion as to whether the new deep water piers ought to be erected in what is known as Burrard's inlet -- that is, the harbour proper -- or in

what is known as False Creek, or the Kitsilano Indian reserve. Hon. members who represent the city of Vancouver rather favour False Creek, but other gentlemen do not. So the matter will stand in abeyance until I can myself visit Vancouver *** taking the best engineering advice and ascertaining the views of the harbour commissioners.*** (p. 4017. ibid)

Commission Reorganized.

In the fall of 1919 the harbour commission was reorganized, with two of the members replaced. The resignation of Prime Minister Borden had a further unsettling effect on local affairs, as also did the imminence of a general election. As a result, the over-all development program was set aside and work was begun on construction of the Ballantyne Pier in Burrard inlet. This can fairly be said to have been an election year expedient. It would have taken several years to acquire the land for the Kitsilano development and the railway right-of-way to it, whereas plans were ready for the Ballantyne work. It was also equally acceptable to many people in Vancouver.

The Conservative defeat was followed by the final shelving of the False Creek schemes of the harbour commission.

The Harbour Commissioners who first held office rather favoured proceeding with the Kitsilano scheme, but before it was definitely decided, a change in Government, with a corresponding change in the personnel of the Commission,

13. Land for this was bought at a cost of $672,900, and the contract was let at between $3 and $4 million.
14. While the Meighen (who had succeeded Borden) government was defeated, Vancouver returned its Conservative members.
took place, with the result that the majority of the new Commission decided to proceed with the first large pier-
development at Burrard inlet.\footnote{A.D.Swan, "Vancouver Harbour, B.C.", No.27, Selected engineering papers, Institute of Civil Engineers, London, 1925, p.7}

Besides, the construction of Ballantyne pier more than consumed the original $5 million loan, and there was nothing left from it for work in False Creek. The only reminder of the original plans of 1919 is a two-block-long strip of land owned by the harbour board, on the north side of First avenue between Main and Ontario streets, the first and only property acquired by the harbour commission for its right-of-way to the Kitsilano development.

The federal government, when it set up the harbour commission, vested in it all property held in right of the crown federal in the harbour area.\footnote{Canada, Statutes,1913, C.54.s.14.} This included a Burrard inlet dock and, more important, all the foreshore to which the Ottawa government believed it held title. Included in this was, it was then believed, the foreshore of False Creek. With these rights, a strong desire to undertake large-scale development, and the backing of the federal cabinet, the harbour commission might well have advanced the coordination of False Creek undertakings. The fact that it was composed of Vancouver men, albeit politically appointed and perhaps beholden to the party in power, could have meant a sympathetic feeling for the over-all challenge of the False Creek area in
the larger matter of comprehensive industrial and commercial development of the city.

The actual scheme proposed for the development of the Kitsilano peninsula seems, in retrospect, a dubious one. Its only commendation seems to have been that the land there was substantially lower in price than any available on Burrard inlet.\textsuperscript{17} There are certain advantages to having all the deep-sea harbour activities in Burrard inlet, not alone of which is the subsequent use of part of the proposed Kitsilano dock site for park and beach use.

It was not its actual proposals for development, which commend the action of the harbour commission, but rather the attempt of that body to undertake over-all development.

2. Absence of Coordination.

There is one instance of joint consultation between the three levels of government and the harbour commission and it is remarkable only for its failure. The question to be settled concerned the Indian reserve (Kitsilano No. 6) on the south shore near the mouth of the waterway.

\textsuperscript{17} The harbour commission paid some $673,000 for property on which to build a four-berth pier. It was estimated that enough land for a 20-berth installation could be obtained on the Kitsilano peninsula for about $1 million.
The land was expropriated by the Vancouver Harbour Commissioners on 7 September, 1916. The arbitrators appointed to fix the price for this land decided that the Commissioners should pay $626,000 for same. The price was appealed against on behalf of the Government, whereon the Harbour Commissioners, to avoid further expense, offered the sum of $750,000. In May, 1918, a conference was held at Ottawa between the representatives of the Dominion Government, Provincial Government, and the Vancouver Harbour Commissioners, with a view to arriving at a settlement, in connection with the transfer to the Commissioners of the said lands, but nothing definite was settled.

The matter never was settled between these participants. An agreement had been reached between the province and the Indians without the concurrence of the Indian Affairs department. The province gave the Indians $300,000, paid directly to them. No further provincial action was ever taken, however, and the money was never refunded or the province given title to the land.

Another example of lack of coordination occurred after the city built a new "high-level" (as it was then called) crossing of the waterway at Granville street, in 1908. This bridge had a swing span which opened (on a center pier) to an over-all channel width of 369 feet. When the federal government created Granville island six years later, no consideration was given to the original plans and recommendations upon which the dredging was undertaken, or to the effect of narrowing or restricting

19. See page 65
20. Federal order-in-council P.C. 318, 27 February, 1928, recognized a provincial lien against the reserve to the amount of $350,000, as representing the payment and the reversionary interest.
the channel width in the vicinity of the bridge.21

The failure between levels of government to coordinate is not directly due to False Creek or its problems. It can be attributed rather to the absence of any established means of easy and continuing communication between the levels. There is nothing to prevent communication, but there is, at the same time, nothing existing to provide it. Each negotiation requires a new ad hoc arrangement. The creation of joint or special machinery had never occurred, except in the case of the harbour commission, until the circumstances have become so strained as to interfere with easy solution.

3. Developments Due to the War.

The war did not have an effect on the False Creek development in the early years, nor did it interfere with the public works then being carried out there.

21. Most unfortunately, this Granville island has been carried much too far into the middle of the channel. * * *, thereby restricting the future width of the channel at the lower end to about 400 feet instead of 600 feet as originally designed, in addition to which the line of the main front wharfage is not parallel to the centre pier abutment of the new 1909 Granville bridge. Consequently it will not be possible to moor vessels at the island wharfage on the lower side of the bridge, otherwise there would be every tendency for a vessel passing through the bridge pier opening to collide with a vessel moored at the island. (Swan, A.D., Report on Vancouver Harbour, 1919, p.8.)
and its current and future effect, on the city was only slight. With the creation of two new areas of industrial land, one 300 acres and the other 32, the effect on later years should have been foreseen to some extent at least.

Action by the city during this period was limited (by depression following collapse of the land boom) to completion of the work in progress on the False Creek crossings and the completion of the agreement with the Canadian Northern for the development of that part of the east end flats retained after the 'horseshoe' grant to the Great Northern. It was a lengthy and detailed arrangement, with provisions for many things, including future streets and over-passes, but it was not accompanied by any plan of the city to relate the contiguous areas to the new function. Surely that was the time, when there was great expectations for the industrial future of the flats, to have some expectations for the neighboring lands too, and to assist them by some development and land-use planning. Instead, the contiguous land, originally the shore of the mud flats, gained nothing, and in some cases lost, by the new development.

The provincial government had given to the city the mud flat area so that it could be developed, and now confirmed the agreements with the railways, by legislative enactments. Surely that government could have been expected to look at the remaining foreshore and bed of the waterway and think in terms
of its development too. There is no evidence that this was done.

The federal government's dredging operations resulted in a great improvement which might reasonably have been expected to be followed by a much greater commercial and industrial use of the waterway and its shores. No attention was given to the space behind this channel, however, and in a number of instances it was not accessible from the shore property. A few years earlier the federal government had made extensive crown grants of foreshore lands,\textsuperscript{23} which implied a belief that title and responsibility for this foreshore was with the crown federal. Yet there was no attempt to carry this channel development onto the foreshore or upland property, where it might well have been extended. A not too commendable exception is Granville island which was created near the mouth (in large part because there was nowhere else to put the dredged material) for there, too, the island's relationship with the shore and access to it were left wholly to chance.

This period was certainly a time when coordination of action by the three levels of government was possible of achievement and could have yielded significant results. For the first time all three levels shared a similar interest in

\textsuperscript{23} See pages 69-70.
the waterway and were involved in the development in some measure. Had there been conceived a False Creek agency with statutory authority over the interests of the three levels, the results would almost certainly have been beneficial. Such planning as was being done by the Vancouver Harbour Commission could scarcely have been a handicap today and likely would have been an aid, particularly if it had included representation from the city hall. All that was necessary was a willingness to negotiate, and a desire to accomplish reasonable purposes, either through direct means or the offices of a jointly appointed commission.
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Map showing general area of Kitsilano peninsula and False Creek entrance, with proposed deepsea wharfage and terminal development.
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PLAN OF A.D. SWAN, 1919

from: Harbour and Shipping
Vol. 1, No. 7, May, 1919, p. 204
Administrative action during the twenties was concerned with a great deal of negotiation at the senior government levels and a substantial amount of planning at the municipal level, none of which resulted in any public works for False Creek at any level. The provincial government asserted its claim to the bed of the remaining waterway, and had these claims acknowledged both by the federal government and the Canadian Pacific Railway. The settling of this question modified but did not remove the interests and responsibilities of the three parties in the waterway. Nevertheless it ended for the time being all joint consideration of False Creek problems.

During this same time the city embarked upon town planning, and the proposed work included a comprehensive development of the waterway as part of the over-all plan for the city. But reception of the plan was mixed, it paid no attention to the administrative complexities standing in the way of its implementation, and it never got farther -- in so far as its proposals affected False Creek -- than the drafting board. The waterway proposals were beyond the financial and administrative ability of the city, but the
assistance of the senior governments was not offered. No evidence was found of their being approached at the time the plan was put forward. Even if they had been, however, it cannot be assumed that they would have participated. Still, as this was the only way implementation might have been achieved, it surely deserved consideration.

The period of the twenties, while depressed in the beginning, ultimately achieved the highest level of prosperity the country had ever experienced.\(^1\) It was a time when men had abundant reason to look to the future with realistic optimism, and might have been expected to undertake over-all planning of the economic, physical and social development of the port and city. The Vancouver Harbour Commission, during this time, built wharves and grain elevators in a large-scale port development of Burrard inlet, but the False Creek area, which is of interest here, was not made a part of this development.

The same prosperity, on the other hand, was the occasion for undertakings by private enterprise in the waterway and basin. As has been stressed before, however, these undertakings were made without direction or aid from public works or public planning.

\(^1\) The opening of the Panama canal in 1914-15 gave the West Coast a direct and competitive sea route to Europe and made Vancouver the sea port for all Western Canada. Grain shipments alone increased its activity to a level hardly forseen by the most optimistic expectations.
1. The Harbour Commission Withdraws.

In 1916 the Vancouver Harbour Commission had sought to expropriate the Kitsilano Indian reserve from the federal government in order to undertake substantial development — on it and adjoining lands of the Kitsilano peninsula — of railway terminals and deep sea docks. Like so much else that has happened in False Creek, this affair was complicated because it touched upon the interests of more than one agency and more than one level of government. The provincial government claimed a reversionary right in the reserve land (as it did in all other reserves which it had turned over to the federal government at the time of union) but its claim was a matter of some uncertainty, never having been a part of any agreement or tested in the courts.

At first the Commission made substantial efforts to bring its negotiations for the reserve to a satisfactory conclusion.

The matter went to arbitration and the Arbitration Award was appealed by the Dominion Authorities to the Supreme Court of British Columbia. The expropriation proposal dragged along until 1926 when the Harbour Commission finally decided to abandon any interest in the property as a site for docks and terminals.

2. While the action was nominally that of one government agency against another, an unusual circumstance, it was actually an action against the Indians for whose land the Indian Affairs branch was trustee.
3. H.M. Jones, director, Indian Affairs Branch, department of Citizenship and Immigration, Ottawa, 18 September, 1953, file No. 167/30-7-6 (R.T.), letter to writer.
Failure to settle the difficulties that arose in connection with the claims to the Indian reserve of the two senior governments, prevented any action at Kitsilano by the harbour commission in the early twenties. Before ownership to the reserve was resolved, the province raised the larger question of ownership of all foreshore property on the waterways of British Columbia. Action in False Creek by the commission, possibly only if the waterway was within the federal sphere of interest, was deferred while the question was being settled, and abandoned after it was decided in favour of the province.

2. The False Creek Foreshore and the Crown.

Before the colony of British Columbia entered the Canadian confederation, all the lands below highwater mark were the property of the crown, unless they had been granted, quit-claimed or pre-empted. Under the terms of confederation those provincial (colonial) properties which were public harbours became the property of the crown in right of Canada⁴ and all others of the crown in right of the province. Straightforward as this appeared to be, it was later to lead to uncertainties as to what was a "public harbour" in the terms of the act. The B.C. government adopted the policy that "public harbours" was a very limited category, whereas the federal govern-

ment from it's actions appears to have held the view that any waterway or shore used or usable by the public was a "public harbour" as included in the B.N.A.Act. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in so far as it dealt with the matter, held that the question depended solely upon the fact of whether or not the waterway and shore was in use as a public harbour at the time of confederation (or union)\textsuperscript{5}.

The result of this uncertainty has already been\textsuperscript{noted} in the action, by both the provincial and federal crowns, of making grants of foreshore lots in False Creek. It became the practice of persons occupying or seeking foreshore lots to attempt to secure a crown grant or quit-claim from both governments. As development along the shore increased, and with the completion of dredging of the channel in 1916, the uncertainty as to which crown was paramount became an increasing obstacle to private development.

The question of which crown owned the foreshore in the waters of British Columbia was not limited to False Creek, and by the twenties had become compelling enough to require settlement\textsuperscript{6}. The provincial Minister of Lands opened negotia-

\textsuperscript{5} Canada, Order in Council, P.C. 941, 7 June, 1924.

\textsuperscript{6} One of it\textsuperscript{3} aspects -- which did not occur in False Creek -- was the matter of leases rather than grants. The federal government charged much lower rates for it\textsuperscript{3} leases than the province, so that leasees preferred a federal to a provincial lease. (Hon.T.D.Pattullo, Minister of Lands 1917-28, Premier 1934-41, letter to writer, 17 September, 1953.)
tions with the federal Department of Marine and Fisheries in 1922.\textsuperscript{6a}

Six Federal Harbours.

The province conceded that there were six harbours in B.C. which were "public harbours" at the time of union and in which it was, therefore, ready to recognize the authority of the federal government. The Minister of Lands (at that time) states that the province gave a wider interpretation to the classification that had ever been made by the courts.\textsuperscript{7} The federal government, for its part, withdrew from "all other ungranted foreshore of tidal or non-tidal waters and lands covered with water in B.C.", except those in the "railway belt," those transferred by other agreements, and certain properties necessary to perform or continue to perform the duties and responsibilities of the federal government.\textsuperscript{8}

\textsuperscript{6a} To settle this difference of opinion *** the late Honourable Ernest Lapointe, then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the Honourable T.D. Pattullo, Minister of Lands of British Columbia [began] negotiations [which] were followed through by staff members of the Department[s] until an agreement was reached in 1924 setting out precisely the limits of six (6) harbours in British Columbia that would be under federal jurisdiction; the remaining waterlot property within the province would be provincial land. (Canada, Dept. of Transport, File 9600-4, quoted by office of Minister of Fisheries, in reply to the writer's inquiry.

\textsuperscript{7} "To define the harbours we would cut a wide swath much wider than the court declared as to what constituted a public harbour." (Pattullo, letter)

\textsuperscript{8} Canada, Order in Council, op., cit., ss. 5-8.
Negotiations were concluded in the spring of 1924 and each government issued an order-in-council embodying the same terms of agreement. The federal government's proprietary interest in the foreshore and bed of waterways in B.C. was henceforth confined to the six national harbours, and did not extend to False Creek. As a result the bed and foreshore of False Creek was recognized as being provincial property, except that which had already been "granted, quit-claimed, leased, or otherwise dealt with" by either government. Included in that which had already been disposed of were D.L. 2037 and 2064 granted to the city of Vancouver, within which were foreshore lots crown granted or quit-claimed to the upland lot owners, and a crossing granted to the Great Northern Railway (V.V. & E.R. & N. Co) by the city and D.L. 5605 crown granted by the federal government to the C.P.R.

Granville Island.

No specific mention was made in the agreement of Granville island, although it is apparent now that the island did not readily fall under any of the conditions. It was reclaimed from the bed of the waterway and, therefore, would appear to be provincial property. It was, however, quit-claimed by the federal government to the Vancouver Harbour

9. Ibid. The provincial order, P.C.507, is dated 6 May, 1924.
10. By the agreement, the port of Vancouver, and therefore the area of jurisdiction of the Vancouver Harbour Commission, did not extend past the First Narrows.
11. Ibid., s. 11.
Commission, but the charter of the Commission retained for the Crown in right of Canada a reversionary interest in all foreshore property turned over to the commission. As a result there is some uncertainty as to whether the agreement acknowledged all grants or only those which were without restriction, and if the latter whether the province now has a reversionary interest in Granville Island. In the opinion of Honourable T. D. Pattullo, provincial Minister of Lands at the time the agreement was made, "Granville Island was built and maintained, and rent collected by the Dominion [the Vancouver Harbour Commission and (after 1936) the National Harbours Board] but the province owns the site upon which it is built." The agreement would seem only to commit with certainty both governments to the leases of the property on Granville Island. It leaves a doubt as to the ownership, and hence the rightful recipient of the rentals from those leases.

With the establishment of its paramountcy over the unalienated portions of the bed of False Creek, the provincial government was in a position to examine the conditions and uses being made of this bed and foreshore, and it proceeded to do so.

12. 13 April, 1915. Vancouver Harbour Commission, Report, 1932, p. 32. The actual reclamation of the island was undertaken by the commission after it gained title. Cost was borne by the commission.
13. Canada, Statutes, 1913, c. 54, s. 14.
3. The Crown, the Foreshore, and the C.P.R.

The 1885 agreement between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the province of B.C., whereby the railway extended its line from Port Moody to Coal Harbour and English Bay, was separate and distinct from the railway's agreement with the federal government, and the terms were not the same. Nevertheless, the railway made no distinction between what were its federally granted and its provincially granted rights. In False Creek, where only the latter applied, the company from time to time acted as if the former were applicable.

The provincial government had granted to the railway District Lots 526 and 541. The northern boundary of the former was (and is) the shoreline of False Creek between Trafalgar and Cambie streets, and the southern boundary of the latter the shoreline between Burrard and (approximately) Carrall streets. The

---

15. See page 32.
16. The statutory terminus was Port Moody by the terms of the federal agreement. The line to Vancouver was a branch only, and governed by the provincial agreement. The former gave the railway complete rights to use any foreshore adjacent to its right-of-way, the latter made no such provision.
17. "The railway company claims in addition to its rights as riparian owner certain rights under Clause 18 of its charter to take use and hold the lands below high water mark in False Creek for its railway and other works, and that it has under the said power occupied portions of the land below high water mark in False Creek." (B.C., Dept. of Lands, File 84126, unsigned resume of arrangements respecting False Creek lands [1927]."

This was borne out by a responsible official of the company, in an interview described as being for unofficial and informal purposes only.
title held by the company was, therefore, only to the upland lots and did not include the foreshore.  

In the only area of the False Creek shore where the company developed the property and foreshore for its own uses, it obtained a federal crown grant to the foreshore property. Along the remainder of the shore which it owned, it did, however, lay trackage, and leased the land along its right-of-way to industrial users.

By 1924, when the provincial and federal governments agreed that the bed and foreshore of False Creek was held by the crown in right of the province, the shore lots of False Creek, owned by the railway, were largely occupied by industrial and commercial establishments, many of which used the waterway in their business.

Foreshore Encroachments.

Use of the waterway, in a number of instances where operations were some distance from the dredged channel, had required the construction of wharves and the filling of tidal shore. This work had been undertaken from time to time by the

18. Generally speaking, but certain only by decision of the courts, upland lots touching the ripa are possessed with riparian rights. There has never been any question that the C.P.R. has riparian rights in False Creek, although it might be questioned.

19. See page 40.
occupants as necessary. It was not done, however, by the rail-
way, but by its tenants.

It is evident from [aerial] photographs that the C.P.R.
are in occupation of large areas of foreshore and that
other concerns and industries are also occupying various
portions of this foreshore, possibly by arrangement with
the C.P.R.

I understand [C.P.R.] have a quit-claim from the
Dominion government covering a portion of this foreshore,
although same is not on file in the Land Registry Office
at Vancouver.20

Although the question of crown rights in False
Creek was still before the two governments, the province
moved in August 1923, to clarify its position vis-à-vis
private owners. Notices were posted throughout the water-
way area, and advertised in the daily papers, over the name
of the Minister of Lands, that

all persons occupying provincial property in False Creek
*** are hereby notified that application to continue such
occupancy must be made to the undersigned within 60 days,
ailing which it will be assumed that such occupants are
not desirous of acquiring any rights in the premises and
disposition will thereafter be made of the property, irres-
pective of present occupancy.

The files of the Lands Department do not reveal
any wide compliance with this order, nor any police action
taken in default of it. The people likely to be affected
were nearly all tenants of the C.P.R. and appear to have

20. B.C. Dept. of Lands, File 048602, "Memorandum of
Surveyor General, 13 July, 1923."
dealt through the company. The company took its stand behind its charter and certain federal grants. The province was not in a position to deal directly with the matter then, as the agreement with the federal government had not yet been concluded, and direct negotiations between the C.P.R. and the government were deferred for the time being.

The provincial government eventually pressed the matter strongly to its conclusion, with a feeling that it had strong claims to, and interest in, the False Creek area which required speedy resolution. This urgency, which had never before affected administrative action in respect of False Creek (and has not since), arose from a feeling that revenues rightfully belonging to the province were not being received. In this regard the Premier explained

the position I take in regard to the foreshores of False Creek, acquired by the Railway Company for its works, is that the latter should pay compensation to the Province for such foreshores either by way of rentals or purchase moneys, and that as far as rights over any portion of the foreshore not in use for the railway or its works are concerned, the Railway Company has no rights whatsoever.

22. File 92B of the C.P.R. Law Department contains a very complete record of the correspondence between the railway and the provincial government, as well as other pertinent material. It is regarded by the company as a private matter, however, and was not made available for the purpose of this study.

23. B.C. Dept. of Lands, File 48602, "Memorandum from the premier to the Deputy Minister of Lands, re: False Creek foreshore," 10 Jan., 1924.
The C.P.R. Negotiates.

Following the settlement between the province and the federal government, and the election that year, the provincial government and the C.P.R. began negotiations.

The federal government's relinquishments of all rights to False Creek left the railway with no claim to anything but the upland lots and riparian rights, together with the one grant of foreshore by the federal government. This latter the province recognized under the terms of the federal-provincial agreement.

The question left to be settled was: Where did the railway's land end, and the provincial foreshore begin? This, it was recognized by both parties, was less a matter of negotiation than of a comprehensive land survey to determine the line of the high water mark when District Lots 526 and 541 were granted to the railway by the province in 1885. With the C.P.R. concurring, W.G. McElhanney, B.C.L.S., was appointed by the provincial government to settle this question.

The survey took two years to complete, and its findings—

24. The John Oliver Liberal government went to the people in the summer of 1924, and was returned without a majority (Lib. 23, Con. 17, Lab. 3, Prov. 3, Ind. 2). In the previous legislature Vancouver had Liberals in four of its six seats at dissolution (one was vacant). In 1924 Liberals were elected to five of the seven seats (Vancouver's representation had been increased). The firm policy of the provincial government towards the federal government and the C.P.R. in False Creek either was approved by the Vancouver voters or else did not matter enough. The fact that the government lost support elsewhere would suggest the latter.
ings were presented in 1927. It raised the problem of whether the line dividing provincial from the railway property should run in exact conformity with the original shore line, or should in some cases be arbitrarily drawn to allow an easier apportionment of values than would be possible on the basis of the original and very sinuous shoreline. On the north shore there was not sufficient development to be of concern, but on the south shore, there were buildings and improvements enough to favor the arbitrary line, which was adopted. Following this division of the land, it became necessary to apportion the total value of the improved areas between the two owners so that the rents received could be equitably divided between them.

Values Assessed.

To this end the province appointed the Hon. John Hart, to act for it in negotiating the value of the land, and the railway company appointed D.W. Reeve, of the firm of Johnson, Reeve, and Watson, valuators, to act for it.

The two parties reached agreement in 1928. The provincial government made certain outright grants of foreshore to

27. Prior to his defeat in the 1924 election, Mr. Hart had held the portfolio of Finance and Industries in the John Oliver government. He was later (1941) to be premier of the Coalition government. Mr. Hart was a partner of the real estate firm of Gillespie, Hart and Todd.
28. Reeve, D.W., personal interview with writer, July 10, 1953. (Mr. Reeve is a person of long experience in appraising and valuating, and highly regarded in his profession).
property to the railway and the railway company, for its part, abandoned all claims which it had theretofore made against the balance of the provincial crown lands. In addition, the province demised to the railway all the crown-owned foreshore lots for a 21-year-period, with a right to renewal for a further 21 years. In return for this the railway agreed to turn over to the province all rentals collected from the property so demised. In addition the company agreed to sublet the property "with due diligence", to "endeavour to have the same at all times occupied", and to obtain for the province "as favourable a revenue as possible." 29

From this agreement the province gained:

a. revenue which it had not previously had,
b. management and supervision of its False Creek lands at no cost to itself,
c. acknowledgement by the railway of its rights in False Creek.

and the Canadian Pacific Railway gained:

a. title to certain foreshore lots previously contested by the provincial government;
b. the privilege of selecting, controlling and removing tenants of the lands adjoining its spur tracks on the north and south shores of False Creek. This meant that the company could select tenants on the basis of freight potential to the railway.

29. Indenture, 31 December, 1928, between His Majesty the King, for the Province of British Columbia, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.
30. District Lots 4672, 4673, 4678, 5603, 5606, Gr. 1, N.W.; roughly some 25 to 30 acres, or something over three quarters the area of Granville Island.
PROVINCE -- C. P. R.

Foreshore Agreement 1928

Areas outlined red original crown-held foreshore but filled by railway. Ceded to C.P.R. by B.C. government.

(Maps from City of Vancouver, Lands Department.)

1 inch = 600 feet
Effects of the Agreement.

While it is not necessary to decide here which party gave more in reaching the agreement, it is desirable to examine the terms, and the effects these terms have had (and are likely to have in future) on False Creek development, to determine whether the public interest was best served.

The provincial government yielded a considerable area of foreshore to the railway, and in return the railway gave up certain claims to the foreshore which it had made solely (as far as could be learned in this study,) on the basis of its federal charter. The question of whether or not the charter provisions apply west of Port Moody can only be decided finally by the courts. The company, however, did not establish any reasons why they should apply. The counter argument that the arrangement for the 12-mile branch line from Port Moody to Coal Harbour and English Bay was wholly a provincial arrangement, and subject only to the terms of the 1885 agreement, between the province and the railway, appears the more substantial (from the information disclosed by this study).

By the 1928 agreement the riparian rights of the railway's upland lots were established. Prior to the agreement, however, foreshore development by the railway's tenants (of those lots) had substantially impaired such rights. Improvements and fills, whereby the property was extended towards the channel had, in many cases, reduced or eliminated access, ingress,
and regress to the upland property by water. This might well have been regarded as either extinguishing the riparian rights, or diminishing them, so as to affect the amount of any compensation which might have to be paid the railway should public development affecting its riparian rights ever be necessary. This of course is a question which would, in all likelihood, ultimately depend upon a court decision for its resolution.

At the time the agreement was being negotiated the city's Town Planning Commission was drawing a city-wide development plan which included False Creek. Little or no consideration appears to have been given to this plan in formulating the agreement, despite the fact that participation in, or compliance with, the Commission's proposals might, and properly ought to, have been made a condition of the agreement. As it was made, the agreement had rather the other effect, establishing the position of the railway firmly where it was previously in doubt, and providing it with the opportunity, which it did not have as certainly before, of participating in any future development wholly on its own terms.

It must be pointed out, however, that the Deputy

31. It must be added, in fairness, that the Town Planning Commission was no more than an advisory body, and its proposals were not necessarily those of the city council. The cost of preparing the plan for the city was, however, voted by the city council, which might have been expected, in consequence, to have sought recognition in the provincial agreement of the development problems and proposals contained in the city plan.
Minister of Lands was of the opinion that

As the C.P.R. are the riparian owners of the greater part of False Creek it was necessary to come to some agreement with them. Otherwise the government could only issue a lease subject to such riparian rights as might by law be established. As riparian rights are understood as giving the right of ingress, egress and regress it could readily be seen that a lease subject to riparian rights would be practically valueless.

The agreement with the C.P.R. would appear to be very favourable to the government, and it was arrived at only after frequent consultations with the tenants affected, the City Council of Vancouver, the B.C. Electric Railway, and anyone whom [sic] it was considered would be affected by the agreement. **32

Before the agreement with the C.P.R. was concluded there was a provincial general election in which the Liberal Government went to the people under the leadership of J.D. MacLean (John Oliver had died the year before). The Conservatives were returned with a substantial majority (Con.35, Lib. 12, Lab.1) and it was the government of Premier S.F.Tolmie (elected under the slogan "a businessman's government") which concluded and signed the agreement. The terms of the indenture fall considerably short of those which Premier Oliver had sought in 1923 (see page 128).

Whether because of the change of government, or simply because the province's negotiations over False Creek had been concluded, the interest of the provincial government in False Creek came virtually to an end at that time. One effort was

32. B.C.Dept. of Lands, File 48602, "Memorandum to the Minister of Lands," 15 Jan., 1929.
made to maintain it, but it was not successful. G.A. Walkem, one of the six provincial Conservative members for Vancouver, wrote to Premier Tolmie that

***just at the time it is exceedingly vital that some definite plan be adopted, or at least enquired into, for the ultimate development of False Creek, the Crown are going to agree to tie this property up for practically forty-two years.

I am going to have considerable to say in the House in regard to the False Creek area when the Session is on***.

I again suggest to you that a full investigation *** should be made into this question before any of this property is alienated from the Crown ***.33

Mr. Walkem, who was at that time, managing director of the Vancouver Machinery Depot and Vancouver Iron Works, two business firms on the False Creek south shore, (the former affected by the arrangement in so far as its buildings and improvements occupied both C.P.R. and provincial land), introduced a motion to the legislature, and then withdrew it, urging the government to defer its agreement with the railway and appoint a commission "to investigate the proposed plans for the improvement of False Creek." This was desirable, his motion pointed out, because the Town Planning Commission of the city of Vancouver, under the guidance of experienced consulting engineers, has "prepared plans for the ultimate development of such False Creek area ***".34

33. G.A. Walkem, letter to Premier, 7 Jan. 1929 (B.C., Dept. of Lands, File 48602).
34. B.C., Journals, 29 Jan., 1929; pp. 18-19.
4. The City's Plans for False Creek.

During 1924 and 1925 the last in the series of dock and terminal development plans for the Kitsilano peninsula was proposed by the city's engineering department, and was a much modified version of the Swan proposal (p.115). Less berthing space was envisaged, and shore development was limited to the Indian reserve property. Its one novel feature, however, was the inclusion of a bridge south from Burrard Street which, by combining traffic and rail crossings on two different decks, would have permitted the removal of the Kitsilano trestle. The scheme was put in abeyance, however, when the form of Harland Bartholomew and Associates, town planning consultants, was appointed to draft a city plan.

The first Vancouver administrative agency with town planning as its responsibility --

a sub-committee of the City Council, augmented by outside members, was functioning during the year 1925, and through its efforts a provincial Town Planning Act was passed in December of that year. A Commission was appointed in the following March, and the firm of Harland Bartholomew and Associates retained as its consultants by August. The work of Town Planning then proceeded apace

35. B.C.Dept. of Lands, file 84126, sketch plan and correspondence.
36. The planning firm subsequently proposed a civic center development on the north side of False Creek west of Burrard, and recommended that the shore opposite (the Kitsilano peninsula) be developed as park so as to provide a pleasing prospect from the proposed center. (Vancouver Town Planning Commission, A plan for the city of Vancouver, 1928, pp 236ff.)
In December, 1928, the Bartholomew firm submitted to the Town Planning Commission an over-all plan for the city of Vancouver, which in turn was published and in that way submitted to the public. The plan was never formally adopted by the city council, but many subsequent city developments were in keeping with its proposals.

Hudson Report.

Included in it was a proposal for a comprehensive development of the False Creek waterway and basin, both as an industrial and commercial entity and as an integral part of the community. A special report by W.D. Hudson, recommended that railway activities in the C.P.R. centre yards on the north side of the Creek, being "detrimental to civic development, should be transferred to other localities." leaving only such rail facilities as were needed to serve the industrial development which could then replace the yards. The committee concurred generally with this and it was made a part of the city plan (Plan p. 141 & 148). Hudson further re-

37. Ibid., p. 24
38. Ibid.
39. Ibid., pp. 147-53. This was based on the recommendations of the commission's Transportation and Harbour Committee (Appx. VI, pp. 290-2).
commended that a freight terminal yard be established at the east end of the False Creek reclaimed area. (report, p.6).

The Committee reported that this was already under construction (plan, appx.VI, p.290) and it was not, therefore, made a part of the development plan.

About the over-all development of False Creek, Hudson had this to recommend (p.44):

A twenty foot channel, of maximum width probably not exceeding 500 feet, turning basins, vertical concrete quay walls to prevent the exposure of tidal flats, interceptor sewers to eliminate the sewage inflow, back filling, and eventually the closure of the easterly arm that projects to Georgia Street [on the line of Columbia Street].

By way of observation he remarked that the development could be achieved only through co-operation of the authorities affected. He added:

The Canadian Pacific Railway and the B.C. Electric Railway, if sympathetic to this or any other plan for the improvement of the district, can immensely facilitate the work as their interests are largely predominant. This one project offers a most splendid opportunity for a co-operative and constructive effort that will, with absolute certainty, result in gratifying benefits to the entire community.

In respect to the Granville island, Hudson recommended that the "back channel" between the island and the mainland be filled in "if the proper arrangements can be made" (p.54). In the matter of these "arrangements", and possible difficulties in making them, he observed that

The policy of creating such an island in the first place may seem questionable, as it would appear that a more efficient channel would have been possible if the filling in had been along both shore lines.***
However, as the shore property is practically all privately owned [by the C.P.R.] it is probable that the title to the filled lands would have had to remain with the private owners, whereas by creating the island, riparian ownership was not disturbed and the Harbour Board retained control of the newly created land. (p.52)

This raises a point, but does not otherwise verify or amplify it, which must touch upon most of the development proposed for the waterway, namely the administrative and legal problems of creating a bulkheaded channel with back-filling of the area between it and the existing shore. If all the land between any proposed channel and the existing shore line could be rightfully claimed by the owners of the upland lots on the existing shore, by virtue of their riparian rights, then a major justification for proposing such development — that it would be financially self-liquidating, by making it possible to recover the cost of development through sale or lease of the reclaimed land, (see page 131) — would not obtain. At the same time there would be raised, as an argument against such development, the possibility that the present owners would be substantially and gratuitously benefited by the work. The resolution of such a question may have to come, in the final analysis, from the courts, as matters now stand.

Provincial Neglect.

The Hudson recommendations were made to the Trans-

41. A means of implementing plans for development of False Creek which might not have to face this difficulty, if it is in fact a valid one, will be discussed in the final chapter.
portation and Harbour Committee in September, 1927, and had been preceded, a few months earlier, by a preliminary report on the False Creek waterway to the planning commission by its engineer, Major A.R. Mackenzie. Both recommended the back-filling of the shore to a bulk-headed channel. These recommendations were endorsed by the committee and the commission, in 1928, and were published as part of the Vancouver plan. A basic requirement of the proposals was the ability to obliterate the existing shore and make a new one. Without this, the whole development plan for False Creek, as then envisaged, could not have even been started. For these reasons it would seem to have been very desirable to have resolved this question in the agreement signed 31 December, 1928, between the provincial government and the C.P.R., in as much as the former owned all the fore-shore, but the latter owned the upland lots which possessed, it was generally conceded, riparian rights.

The responsibility for failing to do this, and for not including in the agreement provisions which would have allowed the planned development, must rest first with the provincial government. If, in fact, as was stated (see p. ) representatives of the city were consulted before the agreement was concluded, then the city ought to have sought, or, alternatively, brought the Town Planning Commission into the conversations with the province. The certain result of this

42. See Hudson report, op.cit. appx. 3.
failure is that whenever development is undertaken, negotiations with the C.P.R. will not only be required, but the railway's position, because of the agreement with the province, will be much stronger than it was during the negotiations for the agreement. A possible secondary result may be a high compensation payment to the railway in return for relinquishing rights which were only made certain by the actions of the province.

**Total Fill.**

There have always been suggestions that False Creek should be filled entirely. These generally are made with the argument that the need for bridge crossings would thereby be eliminated, the untidy appearance of the waterway would disappear, and valuable industrial land would be created. These same proposals were advanced as a counter measure to the commission's development proposals for the waterway. In answer the Bartholomew firm declared

The investigation establishes the fact that the False Creek channel is too valuable an asset to the city to consider its complete filling and obliteration. Rather, it should be encouraged as an industrial entity of extreme usefulness to Vancouver. ***

To entirely fill False Creek would be extremely expensive and would involve an enormous sacrifice of values now established. Its desirability [total fill] is doubtful either from a standpoint of economics or a standpoint of practicability.43

It is not always realized, when total filling

43. *Vancouver Plan Com.*, A plan, op. cit., pp.147 & 241
is suggested, that the need for bridges would not be eliminated. Unless level crossings were to be tolerated, the existing rail lines on both sides of the waterway (and the additional tracks necessary to serve the industrial lands created) would require that the area still be crossed on bridges or viaducts (which would not, of course, have to be as high as is now required by the presence of the navigable waterway).

In 1928, at the request of the Transportation and Harbour Committee of the Town Planning Commission, W.H. Hudson, Maj. A.R. Mackenzie, and H.R. Seymour made a supplementary report in which it was stated that development of the east end of the waterway could be undertaken (along the lines set out in the Vancouver plan) which would establish the proposed channel and turning basins and create new land by back-filling at a cost of $2 million for quays and whar­fage, $4.5 million for fill, and $3 million to compensate the affected interests, for a total of $10 million. Of the new land, 180 acres would be well suited for industrial development and would have (they estimated) a market value of $75,000 an acre, yielding $13,5 million or a break-even price of $55,000 per acre.

Compared with present day prices for industrial land in the city, this figure is extremely high. Land supplied with

44. Vancouver Sun, 17 Nov., 1928, p. 4.
road and utilities, but otherwise undeveloped, is generally regarded as having a market price of $20-35 thousand per acre, depending upon location. The estimated cost figures, as given in the news report, do not include streets and utilities. Whatever may have been the condition of the land market in 1928 (and there was more undeveloped land available in Vancouver and Burnaby than there is today) such a scheme would not be self-liquidating at today's prices.

Federal Works.

Although the 1924 agreement between the provincial and federal governments had relieved Ottawa of any further responsibility for the False Creek foreshore and bed, the federal government did retain certain responsibilities under the Navigable Waters Protection Act. In line with these a $72,000 appropriation was made by the federal government, in 1928 to pay for dredging, to a depth of six feet at low water, the area between the main channel and installation on the shore. Prior to this undertaking, it was estimated, half the shore property had no access in depth to the channel.45

The need for this improved access had become apparent in 1927, when the city purchased a fire boat for the protection of False Creek, and it was found that some properties could not be reached.

The fireboat, long in demand by False Creek industries -- particularly the saw mills -- was provided by the city in an agreement with 23 False Creek business firms whereby they accepted an annual increase in tax rates to cover the cost. In return, these firms received a 10 per cent reduction in their fire insurance premiums from the B.C. Fire Underwriters Association.46

Also in 1928 the federal government, through the Vancouver Harbour Commission, undertook one of the proposals originally made in the Hudson report. Railway sidings along the south shore of Burrard inlet were proving inadequate for the increased grain shipments moving through the port, and additional yards were needed. These were built at the eastern end of the False Creek reclaimed area, on land obtained from the Great Northern and Canadian National railways. They were a part of a small system known as the Harbour Board Terminal Railway, and connected with the Burrard inlet lines through the Campbell avenue depression north of the east end of the False Creek basin.47

5. Industrial Development.

The twenties were a period of continuing under-

46. B.C., Dept. of Lands, File 48602 (#3)
47. Vancouver Harbour Commission, Report, 1928, p.14
This was named the Glen Yards, and had a capacity of 450 cars. It did much to relieve the terminal congestion,
tainty for private enterprises in the False Creek area. Until the federal-provincial agreement in 1924, which confirmed all grants and quit-claims by either crown, great doubt existed as to the validity of foreshore occupancy. Following that, the negotiations between the province and the C.P.R. caused much uneasiness until, at the end of 1928, agreement was reached as to whether additional rentals and levies might be made by the province against occupants of the foreshore.

Despite these uncertain conditions, the development of the False Creek basin continued. In 1923 the Harbour Commission reported that there was no more land available on Granville island.

All the south shore property of the C.P.R. between Granville and Cambie bridges was filled up during the twenties and many firms enlarged and improved their plants. The city-owned upland and foreshore, between Cambie and Main streets, was fully occupied, most of it at leasehold, but sales were made in two instances.

No development was undertaken on the C.P.R.-owned shore on the north side of the waterway, but the B.C. Electric replaced the Royal City Mill at the foot of Carrall street and established its yards (and later a new gas plant) there, much

of it on filled land. Immediately east of this property, the Great Northern Railway abandoned its early station and freight terminal and removed its swing bridge from the channel.

Perhaps the most ambitious scheme for the False Creek area, which was never realized, was the proposal of Robert Sharp, in the name of the Canadian District Steam Co., to construct on the site of the Sweeney cooperage, immediately east of Cambie bridge, a steam plant to provide central heating for the downtown area of Vancouver. During the early part of 1929 negotiations were conducted with the provincial government and the C.P.R. for the property, but eventually they were discontinued, perhaps with the onset of the 1929 depression.49

-- 6 --

The twenties, then, was a period devoted to much administrative activity, all of which had a substantial bearing upon False Creek, but of a largely negative sort. The provincial government gained control of the foreshore and bed from the federal government and the C.P.R., but in doing so failed to consider the development problems of the area and may, in fact, needlessly have made them more difficult.

49. B.C., Dept. of Lands, File 48602 (2).
The federal government and the Harbour Commission, relieved in 1924 of all the responsibilities of ownership in the area (except for Granville island), ceased playing an active role when this status was established and, after that, did one dredging job and built a railway yard (to serve Burrard inlet) in the False Creek area.

The city aided some of the False Creek businesses to get the protection of a fire boat (and a reduction in insurance premiums) and had elaborate plans drawn for the development of the whole basin, but did not carry out any of the proposals. No new undertakings were made to overcome the waterway as an obstacle, but two new bridges were recommended in the plan for the city.

Industrial development progressed, largely through the expansion of existing industries and the filling up of vacant property on the south and east shores by new establishments. The B.C. Electric was the only business to undertake any substantial development, but in all other areas expansion generally kept pace with the prosperity of the times.

The time had not yet arrived, however, when the administrative agencies could act in concert to provide the means of implementing the over-all development urged in the new plan for the city, generally desired by the residents of the city, and necessary for the full economic utilization of the waterway and basin.
During the twenties the three levels of government came no nearer to solving the problems of False Creek. There was for the first time, however, a considerable awareness of the challenge that these problems presented. The provincial government, by asserting its ownership, seemed for a while both in a position, and ready, to undertake the task of developing the waterway so as to increase its inherent utility. A change of government and a depression intervened, however, and nothing was done.

The city also faced up to the challenge in so far as it commissioned a developmental plan for the community but it too failed to effect any implementation of the plan which sought both to lessen False Creek as an obstacle and increase it as a desirable and necessary area for industrial and commercial activity.

The city's plan, in so far as it proposed the development of False Creek, was beyond its reach financially and administratively. The province and the city together could have undertaken the proposed developments, but no such effort was made.

The planners (both the consultants and the commission) did not realize that for the False Creek segment of the community, the administrative difficulties prevented any implementation of an engineering plan, however attractive and feasible it might otherwise have been.
FALSE CREEK MAP
Development Plan, 1928

Proposed foreshore and crossing developments for False Creek recommended in the Town Planning Commission's 1928 plan for the City of Vancouver.
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Chapter Eight:  
The Effects of Depression and War, 1930 - 45.

The optimistic twenties, with their economic buoyancy, were followed by a period of depression and world war. Whereas in prior times only administrative complexities, particular to the False Creek area, had blocked a solution of its problem; the general and widespread conditions of the thirties and the early forties also stood in the way of the governmental action needed for the effective development of the False Creek basin.

The sixteen year period was one of administrative inactivity. The provincial government retired to the role of absentee landlord. In the first ten years no federal works were undertaken, after which there ensued a period of limited war measures. The city did no more to implement the False Creek aspects of the 1928 plan than to make several unsuccessful attempts to gain provincial participation. Development of the waterway remained almost entirely in the hands of private enterprises which were all but immobilized during the thirties and able to make only war measure expansions in the first half of the forties.

As in the past, the False Creek problems not only
persisted but were intensified as the city and surrounding areas kept up their steady growth. The waterway and basin continued to separate, for more and more people, the residential from the business and industrial area.


Federal action in False Creek during this period was slight. To assist in carrying out the provisions of the Navigable Waters Protection Act, harbour headlines were established on the south shore between Cambie and Main in 1931 and on the north shore in the vicinity of Carrall street in 1932. These also served as maximum limits to which, but not beyond, development could take place.

As a result of the depression which began this period, the Vancouver Harbour Commission found itself in financial difficulties, along with similar agencies for other Canadian ports. The federal government had the national harbour question examined by Sir Alexander Gibb, whose report recommended the replacement of the several harbour commissions by a national harbours board, which was done. Sir Alexander, in his recommendation for the port of Vancouver, observed that

It is particularly desirable that a definite scheme should be drawn up for the proper development and control of False Creek, the importance of which as a part of the port is shown by the fact that it deals with a tonnage of exports and imports said to be as much as three quarters of a million tons in a year, excluding lumber, and the entry and departure of up to 18,000 vessels in a year.

This recommendation, however, was not heeded. It is doubtful, in fact, if the federal government could have done much to implement it, except perhaps by means of a grant-in-aid to the province or the city.

In this period the federal government began to divest itself of the Indian reserve land, a process which went on intermittently over the next 20 years. The first sale of land for development purposes was an inter-departmental arrangement, whereby 4.28 acres were transferred to the Department of National Defence, for the Seaforth Armories.

During the second World War waterfrontage was required by the R.C.A.F. and the section north of the C.P.R. and Burrard bridge rights-of-way was requisitioned by the Department of National Defence for this purpose, the land being held under

3. Ibid., p.180

Previously easements had been granted to the C.P.R. for its right-of-way to Kitsilano (P.C. 549, 13 April, 1928, 3.6 acres) the Vancouver and Lulu Is. R.R. (P.C. 1201, 8 June, 1901, 7 acres), and city of Vancouver for Burrard bridge approaches (P.C. 526, 2 May, 1928, 6.2 acres) and park (ibid., 1.6 acres).

See also, Canada, Dept. of Citizenship & Immigration, Schedule of Indian reserves in the Dominion of Canada, part 2, 31 March, 1943 (as amended).
lease from the Indian Affairs branch. This was sold outright in 1947 and became a permanent military establishment.\(^5\)

Immediately after the war a 4.28 acre section adjacent to the armouries, which had been used for military barracks, was surrendered by the National Defence Department to Reconstruction and Supply, to be used for veterans housing.\(^6\)

The piecemeal disposition of the Indian reserve for a wide range of unrelated uses, and with no apparent thought to the best interests of the city, was another regrettable example of federal indifference. The advantages which might have been gained from its full development, in relation to the surrounding property and the plans for the city, were considerable.

The city made known its desires, but was generally unable, and always unwilling, to make the payment for the land which the Indian Affairs branch of the federal government was committed to obtain for the Indians.

There seems little reason to doubt that if the city, the province, and the federal government had undertaken a large development project east of Burrard bridge embracing the reserve, Granville island, the foreshore between these two and the depressed area south of them, the end result

---


This was disposed of subsequently to Sicks Brewing Co. for a brewery site.
might well have been an industrial area of considerable value and in considerable demand, from which, either by sale or lease, compensation for the Indians could have been obtained.

2. Municipal Undertakings.

With the depression there came a need, or a believed need, for financial retrenchment. Popular opinion and a declining municipal revenue required that costs be cut to the bare necessities. Capital expenditures were not brought to an absolute halt, however, for there was, as there had been when depression came in 1913, a carry over of monies voted, bonds issued, and contracts let. Of major importance among these was the proposed $2.8 million high-level bridge to join the Granville peninsula with Point Grey by linking Burrard and Cedar (later changed to Burrard) streets? Work began on the bridge in 1930 and it was completed in 1933 (opened 1932). It was the first major undertaking in conformity with the Vancouver plan, and the first public work in the False Creek basin which was done with the overall needs of the city as governing factors. It was designed to have two decks -- the upper for vehicular, the lower for railroad traffic -- so as to eliminate the need for the

7. Vancouver, By-law 2040. The city was authorized to borrow $2.8 million, but costs came to just under $2.5 million. It was financed by a 40-year debenture.
Kitsilano trestle. It was estimated that the lower railroad deck would add $700,000 to the construction cost. The C.P.R., for its part, offered to eliminate the trestle if the lower deck were built, and pay $200,000 towards its cost in return for running rights on it. The city was not disposed to spend the extra $500,000 with the result that the trestle remains in position. The railway company is popularly condemned for failing to remove the trestle, but evidence was not obtained, in this study, by which the case might be judged and responsibility assigned for the failure to close, by negotiation or otherwise, the $500,000 gap. It is quite possible that the $200,000 offer represented a substantial compromise from the position in which the agreement just-concluded with the province left the railway. On the other hand, the trestle had always been in marginal compliance with the Navigable Waters Protection Act, and there may have rested on the railway a moral, if not an actual, obligation for a fuller compliance.

8. The railroad trestle was an ever-increasing hazard to navigation. It was not in line with the channel and its shallow footings prevented dredging to a full 20 feet at low water.


Neither the consultants nor the commission entirely favoured having the railway cross the western end of the waterway at all. Preference was expressed for a fill at the east end (to about 500 feet west of Main street) which would carry all rail traffic from the north to the south sides of the waterway. (*Ibid.*, pp. 143 & 148.)
The C.P.R. Tunnel.

Ever since the city of Vancouver outgrew the original Granville townsite, the C.P.R. level crossing from Burrard inlet to False Creek (in the vicinity of Carrall street) had increasingly hampered traffic on Cordova, Hastings, and Pender streets. In 1913 the city had voted to spend $47,000 towards the cost of a subway, but the railway had never been willing to undertake the project. In the early thirties, backed by the firm recommendation of the Vancouver plan, the city again attempted to have the level crossing removed. This time the negotiation were successful, and the tunnel came into operation in 1933, fulfilling another recommendation of the 1929 plan. (The railway now gained access to its False Creek yards near the west end of Georgia viaduct.) The city had agreed to contribute to the cost, and in 1936 approval was given for payment of $439,000 to the C.P.R.

Gerald G. McGeer, M.L.A. for Vancouver Burrard, ran for mayor of Vancouver in 1934 and was elected on a platform of capital expenditures. He gained approval for a three percent 10-year "baby bond" issue to finance projects which included a new city hall and a viaduct (to cost $200,000) joining Terminal avenue on the reclaimed eastern area, over the Great

10. Vancouver, By-law 1008.
Northern tracks to First Avenue and Clark Drive. Work was begun in 1937 as recommended by the Vancouver plan and largely completed within the estimated cost, leaving $18,000 to be spent in the next two years to complete the approaches.

In 1913, when depression had brought a halt to the civic borrowing and large capital expenditures of that time, the crossings of False Creek had represented 10 per cent of the general indebtedness. No further works were done in the waterway basin in the twenties but the addition in the thirties to the general debt of $2.5 million for Burrard bridge, $0.4 million for the C.P.R. tunnel, and $0.2 million for the First avenue viaduct -- a total of $3.1 million -- again increased the False Creek share ($5.8 million) of the city's general debt (approximately $60 million, 1930-45) to 10 per cent. This proportion remained through the low-spending depression and war years.

These figures are a measure not only of the extent to which False Creek as an obstacle is a problem to the city, but of the reasons why the city alone cannot undertake additional large expenditures for developing the economic potential of the waterway. A concentration of more than 10 per cent of the city's capital expenditures in False Creek, regardless of what might be obtained subsequently in the lease or sale of industrial sites, would likely be unattractive to the voters and politically damaging to anyone advocating it. Further, the city has never had a sufficient reserve of bor-
rowing power to recommend a greater proportion of it's capital
debt for False Creek works, and might not receive the approval
of the provincial government.

3. Fate of the Vancouver Plan.

For the city as a whole the Vancouver plan of 1929
had a two-fold purpose. It set a pattern within which the
certain growth of the city should be directed and controlled.
It also proposed a number of capital public works of varying
magnitudes to increase the amenities of the city. Growth
made particular works mandatory, depression or not, but the
rest were optional and depression set them aside. With the
latter was the False Creek problem.

It is difficult to see what other course was open
to the city. False Creek development might well have qual-
ified as a depression "pump-priming" project, but the deficit
financing which pump-priming generally requires is not readily
available to a municipality. The senior governments were at
that time responding to the wishes of economy-minded voters, and
had not yet come around to the idea of cyclical budgeting. As a
result, there was no money available at any level of government
for the False Creek part of the Vancouver plan.

In 1929 the Vancouver Town Planning Commission, with
the authorization of the city council, organized a committee to study False Creek development. The first meeting was called for June and, in a letter to the provincial Minister of Lands, the commission chairman explained that representatives had been invited from the harbour commission, the B.C. Electric, the C.P.R., together with representatives from the commission, the city council, and the provincial government.¹³

This committee met twice in June, the following December, and again in October and December of 1930,¹⁴ and on 15 January, 1931, issued a memorial to the provincial government, praying that the government should establish a "False Creek Commission" and that

1. The Commission should be composed of from one to three members *
2. The Commission should * * * be empowered to employ adequate technical assistance * * *
3. The first duty of the Commission should be to investigate [the 1928] proposals of the Vancouver Town Planning Commission. The guiding principle should be the exchange of [existing] properties for new ones [with compensation for any value differences], according to a replotting scheme to be drawn up by the Commission.
4. Approval of the replotting scheme [should be submitted for] the approval of the Municipal Council and following this, the assent of the owners * * *

It observed that

* * * The creation of 220 acres of new industrial land * * * served by railways and a 20-foot canal, 600 feet in width, will produce handsome returns, As the 175 acres already filled in will be included in the proposals and also, no doubt, other small areas skirting the Creek, there will be at least 400 acres

¹³. B.C. Dept. of Lands, File 48602, (3), 9 May, 1929
¹⁴. Ibid.
involved. Allowing say 25 per cent reduction for streets, lanes and railways, there will be a net revenue-producing area of 300 acres.  

An undated memorandum in the Vancouver Sun Library, says that this memorial together with the Commission's plan was presented to the provincial government at the end of January and that the government "stated it would be given 'prompt consideration," but that "nothing further has been heard from the government." This Sun memorandum also says that the committee of the planning commission which drafted the memorial also included representatives of the C.N.E., the Vancouver Merchants Exchange, and the Shipping Federation of B.C. The Sun memorandum concludes that the

Chief opponents of any scheme involving False Creek, have always been the C.P.R., which owns Kitsilano Trestle, now uses by the B.C.E.F. Any scheme of improvement will involve removal of the trestle. Another stumbling block has been the abandoned G.N.trestle at the head of False Creek [the latter since removed].

"No Progress Made."

The statement that "nothing further has been heard from the government" is, at least, borne out by subsequent inaction. The provincial government appears to have let the matter of False Creek die. Further action on the

15. Vancouver Town Planning Commission, Memorial (respecting) the Development of False Creek (by a joint committee), Vancouver, 15 January, 1931, (mimeo.) p.3 & 4.
16. See "False Creek" file.
17. Ibid.
18. The Lands Department files reveal no correspondence or action indicative of the sort of moves sought by the planning commission.
waterway by the city appears also to have been dropped, short of routine matters. An example (unimportant in itself) of the relative indifference to the whole question of False Creek at the administrative levels, is given by the following extracts from an exchange of letters\(^19\) (in which the time interval should be noted):

Letter to the Surveyor General, Dept., of Lands, 15 Jan., 1934, from Vancouver City Engineer, re Crown Grant to bed of False Creek Under Connaught Bridge:

"Our Surveyor *** has this work (a survey of the area in question) in hand, and returns will be made to you at an early date."

Letter to City Engineer, 14 May, 1945, from Surveyor General, re Bed of False Creek, Connaught Bridge:

"In reference to your letter dated 15 January, 1934, I shall be glad to be advised if the survey of the above described area has yet been completed."

Letter to Surveyor General, Dept., of Lands, 17 May, 1945, from City Engineer, re Bed of False Creek under Connaught Bridge:

"Relative to your enquiry of the 14th instant on the above noted subject, I have to advise you that no progress has been made on the survey *** for possibly the last ten years. Our surveyor, *** ran into difficulties *** necessitating far more extensive field work than had been anticipated. Before this had been completed our staff was reduced [and] most of the survey work then in progress had to be abandoned for the time being."

Excuse for this extraordinary delay is made because of the war, which can only account for the last four years. The engineer omits what is likely the chief reason for inaction in this connection -- the overwhelming burden

\(^{19}\) B.C., Lands Dept., File 60968.
on civic employees of the ordinary, day-to-day "house keeping" duties and responsibilities. Planning matters were all too frequently relegated of necessity to spare time, of which there was never enough for this important task.

In September, 1937, the planning commission forwarded to the city council a memorandum in which it was pointed out that

Since the publication of the 1929 Town Planning Commission Report, conditions in False Creek have probably become worse. It is unsightly, offensive, and a menace to the community's health. Its present status constitutes an extremely uneconomical condition * * *.

The Squatter Problem.

The question of health, referred to by the commission, concerned inter alia the matter of "squatters" who occupied floating and fixed abodes along the shore of the waterway. While not in a position to give consideration to the over-all False Creek problem or plan, the council did refer this particular question to its Social Services Committee. The report made to the latter by a special committee indicated that economic depression and disused shore property had combined to create yet another way in which False Creek was a problem to the city.

20. V.T.P.C., Memorandum to the Mayor and Council, Vancouver, 2 Sept., 1937, (mineo).
The majority of the occupants [of foreshore shacks] are not there by choice. Action might be taken to order vacation and clear the worst locations at an early date, and gradually eliminate this class of housing.

The lack of suitable housing at a rental which the occupants could afford to pay seems to be the main reason for the increasing number using this class of shelter.

The number of house boats and gas boats to some extent has been increased by the vacating of the Indian reserve and with the cooperation of the Harbour Board this condition might be eliminated by setting aside a more suitable location.

All disused piling and wharves should be removed in an effort to improve the appearance of False Creek.

The problem of the False Creek squatters seems to have overshadowed the bigger problem of False Creek development at this time, perhaps because of the frustration arising out of an inability to do anything about the latter and the chance to focus attention on a more emotional and much smaller problem. The public sentiment, or at least the newspaper attention given the problem, was sufficient to prompt the National Harbours Board port manager to write to the Vancouver City Engineer, the C.P.R. chief engineer, and the Deputy Minister of Lands thus:

"You have probably noticed from recent newspaper articles that considerable agitation has taken place lately in connection with the situation in False Creek, and suggestions given as to what should be done to remedy same. In order that we might have proper data before us, I have prepared [a map] showing under whose jurisdiction the foreshore is."

21. Vancouver, Social Services Committee, Report by a special committee to consider the sanitary conditions of False Creek, Vancouver, 22 January, 1938, (mimeo.) p.6
22. B.C., Dept., of Lands, File 60988
What pressure there was to have the squatters removed was generally directed towards the city council, which in turn referred it to the provincial government which owned the foreshore, the C.P.R. which leased the foreshore from the government, or the Harbours Board because of its responsibility for the navigable waterway.

The "squatter problem" has come to be regarded as something of an administrative run-around, and so it has been. Because False Creek is wholly within the city, the preservation of law and order in the waterway area is largely the responsibility of city police. Squatters generally have been orderly, and their unlawfulness has arisen because they occupied land not their own, did not comply adequately with provincial and city health and sanitation codes, and paid no rent or taxes -- this last the most upsetting to many of the critics. To remove the squatters the only requirement has been an order of eviction from the owner of the trespassed land -- the province or, in the case of the Indian reserve, the federal government; a condemnation by the provincial health officer; or an order under the Navigable Waters Protection Act by the Harbours Board (if the offender was not within the harbour headline). With this, city police could then force the withdrawal or lay charges in the courts.

Despite the popular feeling referred to (above) the port manager, the two or three levels of government concerned never acted together at the same time in this matter. In
reality the so-called squatter problem was a very minor one. For one thing it would disappear if there were development of the waterway along the lines of the 1929 plan, for another it was depression born and continued, at least in part, because of a general accommodation shortage — neither cause directly associated with False Creek. The squatter problem is important only as it illustrates the difficulties of inter-government cooperation. It is a prime example of the political and administrative stumbling block which has stopped False Creek action before it got truly started or tripped it before it was in effective motion.

Development Plans -- Once Again.

As the thirties drew to a close and the business depression appeared definitely on the wane, the city council once more turned to the problem of False Creek development. The recent public expression of concern and irritation over the ill-kept appearance of the waterway and the "squatter problem" brought the matter to a head.

At its meeting on the 17 April, 1939, the city council authorized its engineer to undertake a complete engineering survey of the False Creek sector of the city with a view to aiding its development as a shipping channel. The council agreed to

1. Appoint immediately a joint committee of the council and town planning commission.
2. Request the provincial and federal governments, and the Canadian Pacific, Canadian National and B.C. Electric Railways to support the development program and contribute towards the engineering survey.

3. Request the town planning commission to bring up to date its recommendations on False Creek development made originally in the 1929 Vancouver plan.

But the season was too busy and too tense for the move to gain headway. The city's business hung suspended during the visit of their majesties, George V and Elizabeth, and then the war clouds were too heavy on the horizon. Once again events deferred action, and nothing was accomplished.

4. Private Enterprise Development.

Because this period was one of economic depression and of world war, there was much to handicap the increase of industrial activity. Business failures about balanced new activities during the first phase, whereas the second was marked by the special developments of war booms.

In 1932 the B.C. Electric put into operation a new gas manufacturing plant at its Carrall street yards, largely replacing the original works located opposite it on the east side of the Columbia-Keefer street channel. This represented a $1.5 million investment by the company and was capable of a daily output of 3 million cubic feet. 24 To accommodate the new

plant the company had filled out from its original shore line lots onto its foreshore property. The harbour headline was established in this area (see p. 152) to mark the extent of the permissible development.

On the debit side of the development record must be put the failure of the Vancouver Lumber Co., and the Hanbury saw mill, two of the oldest industries in the False Creek area. The former was located at the south end of Cambie bridge and the latter at the south end of granville bridge.

The War Boom.

The economic uncertainties of the thirties were slowly brought to an end by the second World War. The old World War I yards of the Couglin ship-building firm were reactivated and enlarged, the machinery works found their order books filled, and the market for lumber outdistanced the supply. While the only major capital development was the growth of the shipyards east of Cambie bridge, there were very few firms in the area which did not feel the war-time prosperity.

Largely because of the shipyard development, a harbour headline was established for the whole False Creek waterway. This was done by the National Harbour Board in 1942 after consultation with the city council and the B.C. Lands department. The ways of the shipyard and its fitting-out

25. B.C., Lands Dept., File 153490.
dock were extended beyond the headline during the war, and no attention was paid to the matter. In 1947, however, the headline was revised to acknowledge an already accomplished fact. On this occasion, the city was not consulted, however, despite the fact that it had a vested interest in the matter not only because of its concern for general False Creek development, but because the property affected was owned by the city and leased by it to the shipyard. The protest was made firmly but informally to the port manager and an informal promise extracted that a similar situation would not recur.

--- 5 ---

The fifteen years of depression and war were ones during which False Creek area continued development at a much reduced rate and still without any direction or assistance from administrative action. There was a comprehensive plan on the books, but there were not the means at hand to undertake its implementation. This was a result of the plan having been drawn for the city which had neither the money nor full enough authority to do what the project called for, and the reluctance of the senior governments to assist in implementing it, even in so far as their own interests in the waterway were concerned.

26. Vancouver, information imparted to writer while in the employ of the city, July 1952.
FALSE CREEK MAP

Land Use of Shore Property

1953

Map showing location and use of shore property and waterway by types of industry; together with contour lines* and physical features.

* Contour elevations based on City Datum -- approximately 100 feet below high water mark.
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Industrial Classification*

MANUFACTURING
- wood products
- transportation equipment
- iron and steel products
- non-metallic mineral products

CONSTRUCTION
- general contractors

TRANSPORTATION, STORAGE and PUBLIC UTILITIES

TRADE
- wholesale
- retail

SERVICE
- government

*Bureau of Statistics classifications (inter alia).
Chapter Nine:
Post War Developments, 1946 - 1952.

Vancouver experienced a marked growth in both industrial capacity and population during and after the Second World War. False Creek shared in the former and was influenced by the latter.

Growth of the city meant that the problem of False Creek as an obstacle grew too. As in the past, more people meant an increased need for more and bigger crossings of the waterway and basin, for it continued in large part to divide commercial and industrial activities from residential areas. During the war, however, little attention could be given to the problem. No action was possible until building restrictions were removed after the war and the city was able to make sufficient estimate of its financial potentialities to embark upon capital budget planning.

Between 1943 and 1947 the town planning commission undertook the revision of the proposals originally made in the 1928 Vancouver plan. Of the recommendations for lessening

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Vancouver city</th>
<th>Greater Vancouver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>275,353</td>
<td>377,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>344,833</td>
<td>530,728</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Population: Canada, Census
False Creek as an obstacle -- which included bridges for Oak street, the diagonal extension of Kingsway, and an overpass (between Main and Clarke) of the railway yards -- only a replacement for the existing Granville bridge was approved by the city council.

Following the end of hostilities, and for the first time in the city's history, industrial land was not readily available in Vancouver. While there was still vacant land which would ultimately become available, there was a very real absence of cleared and serviced property in sizes and locations suited to the needs of post-war business activities.

The increased, and often unmet, demand for industrial sites, arising first from the war-stimulated industries and continuing, in the post-war period, from an over-all buoyant demand, once more made obvious the neglect of comprehensive development of the False Creek waterway and basin.

1. Industrial Development, 1952.

Immediately ringing the waterway, and either on the shore or inside the circuit of rail lines, there were, in 1952, some 80 business firms. In the balance of the False Creek area (considered here as including all the in-
dustrially zoned in the False Creek basin) there were approximately 375 more.2

The 81 firms within the first industrial ring employed, on the average during 1952, some 5,400 people. The 375 businesses in the remainder of the area approximately 5,000. Half of the jobs were in manufacturing industries, the rest in construction, wholesale trade, transportation and storage.3 Wages for the 81 firms, in 1951, were $17 million, while the second group is estimated to have received between $12 and $13 million, providing a total payroll from the waterway and basin of $30 million.

2. For the purposes of the city's "False Creek Development Survey" - (authorized 1950, begun 1951) the city engineer set as the limits of the area to be studied the 110 foot (city datum, high water mark approx. 100) contour line or the roadway nearest to the shore, which ever was closer. The industrial survey done 1952 by the author was limited to firms within this area -- 81. (Because of a shortage of time, only 3 of the Granville island firms could be included with those personally surveyed.) The count of all those not surveyed was obtained from B.C. Directories, Vancouver & N.W. city directory, 1952.

3. Data for the 81 firms were obtained from the businesses by a personal survey done by the writer on behalf of the city between 23 October and 31 December, 1952. The data for the 375 firms are only an approximation, based on the experience of the city's Industrial Development Office, and a rough telephone sample of about five per cent.

4. On the basis of 50 weeks employment at $50 per week, approximately the average wage for Vancouver in 1951 (Canada, Bureau of Statistics, Employment and payrolls, 1951)
Important Part of City's Economy.

The total business and industrial payroll for all of Vancouver was something less than $250 million in the same year,\(^5\) of which False Creek provided approximately 12 per cent. In 1951 in Vancouver, 125,000 people over the age of 14 years had jobs or were actively seeking them.\(^6\) Thus False Creek businesses provided 8 per cent of the total employment in Vancouver.

The importance of False Creek industries to the economy of Vancouver, is, in all likelihood, greater than these percentages indicate. The total employment figure for Vancouver includes every type of work, whereas the False Creek industries include little or no retail trade, and few of the service occupations. Thus the False Creek area is proportionately heavier, both in the production of goods and providing services which extend beyond the limits of the community. It can be assumed, therefore, that there is an indirect dependence upon this False Creek employment which is not reflected in unadjusted totals.\(^7\)

---

5. B.C., Dept. of Trade and Industry, *Industrial index*, 1952, reports that the 1949 Vancouver layroll (latest figure available) was $232.9 million. A 7 per cent increase in two years would bring it to the estimated $250 million.
6. Canada, Bureau of Statistics, *IX Census*, 1951. Not all of these worked in Vancouver, but the number of employed outside of the city must be assumed, in the absence of other data, to balance approximately the number living outside and employed in Vancouver.
7. The determination of what this factor is cannot be derived from the information at hand. It must suffice here to say that there is a greater degree of "urban growth" employment -- as contrasted with "urban serving" -- in the False Creek area than in the city generally, (For a discussion of "urban
The Waterway's Share.

Because of the special nature of the waterway, and the recurring proposals to fill in, mention must be made that, of the 81 firms making up the initial industrial ring around the waterway in 1952, 30 depended on water access for part or all of their business. These gave employment to 3400 and accounted for $11 million, or more than one third, of the total payroll within the basin.

Just over half of the 5.5 mile False Creek shore line was occupied in 1952 by firms which required the waterway for some or all of their business. These represented a capital investment of $32 million, out of a total of $45 million for the 81 firms in the "first ring". Of that total, $18 million was in manufacturing industries, $10 million of which was accounted for by firms depending on water access.

The remaining half of the shore was almost equally divided between unoccupied land and businesses not depending on water commerce. In some instances these latter had wharf or jetty installations, but did not use them for water access.

growth" and "urban serving" employment and the relative importance to the community, see City Planning Commission, The economy of the Cincinnati metropolitan area, Cincinnati, 1946, pp.22-2.) In the Cincinnati area it is estimated that one "urban growth" job will produce and support as many as 8 "urban serving" jobs. This would be an extremely high factor for the False Creek industries, but even if the factor were only 2, it would indicate an economic significance of the area to the community substantially more than the raw figures reveal.

8. Some firms originally located on False Creek because water transportation was the most economical means of transporting their supplies or finished products. This
The 81 firms in 1952 did a gross business of $90 million, of which $65 million was accounted for by those using the waterway. Manufacturing represented $32 million of the total, and of this $21 million was done by water shippers.

2. A Shortage of Industrial Land.

The pressure of expanding and new industries was strongly felt in Vancouver, and particularly in False Creek, during and after the second World War. Except for the Indian reserve land on the south shore (immediately east of Burrard bridge) and the shore adjacent to the C.P.R. yards, the little land vacant before the war was rapidly occupied in the years immediately after, so that in 1952 the greater part of the waterway perimeter was in productive use. Land utilization, however, was more extensive than intensive, either on a basis of area covered by building, or capital investment measured in dollars per given unit of area.

particularly was the case where goods had to be transshipped between Burrard inlet and the Creek. By 1952 towing and lighterage charges had reached a point where this was no longer so, and in many instances shipping practices changed so that products were brought all the way by rail, or were carried by trucks if still moved by deep-sea vessels.

9. Exceptions to this were Granville island and the areas in the immediate vicinity of Taylor and Pender streets and Glen drive and Venables, where the use was more intensive than extensive.
The sections of the basin lying behind the waterfront and rail-side industrial properties were also largely occupied, but only in part by business activities. North of the waterway the city's downtown business district lay within a few blocks of the industrial area and the two were growing towards one another as fast as the property in between could be acquired and adapted by private businesses. East and south of the waterway, much of the basin lands was residential property which, since being zoned for industrial uses in 1928, had emerged as a transition zone. In these sections residential use was waning and business use, waxing. But neither predominating because the land was not completely suitable for either use.

The effect on the False Creek basin of this shortage of readily available and suitable land, at a price which a new or expanding industry might reasonably pay, was three fold. Expansion continued in three ways. New land was reclaimed from the foreshore by industries on the waterfront, existing industries were displaced or replaced neighbors, and residential property was consolidated to form industrial sites. Such activity did not, however, suffice to meet the over-all development problem.

**Difficulties in New Uses.**

The transition zone into which industrial expansion was largely forced by a general absence of other available space had originally been given a street and subdivision
pattern to meet residential needs. This pattern proved unsuitable for post World War II commercial and industrial needs. The best that private enterprises were able to do with such land was to attempt the purchase of several adjacent parcels to provide the space required.

This is an unsatisfactory procedure. On the one hand it requires the purchaser to negotiate with several owners, any one of whom may prevent the whole undertaking by an unreasonable price demand. On the other, it leaves the existing street pattern, laid down in the first instance to serve residential property, intact and likely to be a restriction on size and a financial burden because of a property assessment based largely on frontage.

The only way out of this difficulty is through condemnation and redevelopment of sizeable areas by the action of a public agency. Federal assistance to municipal redevelopment "for public purposes" is provided in the National Housing Act, but it is not presently clear whether redevelopment for industrial use is a public purpose. Large scale public redevelopment offers the only alternative to the present slow and wasteful method of piecemeal development which leaves the land divided in a haphazard way between residential and business use and with an unsatisfactory street pattern.

Existing Businesses Squeezed.

While new industries, in some cases, were able to locate in the former residential sections, already established industries were hard pressed by the problem or expanding their existing facilities. In many instances they could so so, if at all, only by the displacement of others, or the extension of the property out towards the harbour headline in areas where the shore was sufficiently shallow.

Private Development Inadequate.

The same pressure which brought about the opening of residential and foreshore properties, also meant that previously unoccupied areas, such as that between Connaught bridge and Georgia viaduct, on the north shore, and the portions east of Main street not occupied by the railway yards, were in greater demand by industry.

The latter area experienced, in 1916, the development which had been forecast for it in 1916. Thirty years elapsed between the start of its reclamation and the final development for productive use.

Much the same inaction marked the record of the Canadian Pacific lands on the north side of False Creek. By 1944 the demand for industrial sites became sufficiently
strong to open the area between Connaught bridge and Georgia viaduct. This was the first occasion, in the 60 years that the railway held the land, that it undertook any large scale developments, outside of its own needs for shops and yards.

The south side of the waterway, on the other hand, was leaseable as it stood, and there were always tenants available who would undertake individually such development as they required.

Thus, while a considerable amount of reclamation and development of the waterway was done, in the main, by private enterprises, the greater part was undertaken by individual businesses concerned only with their own particular operations. No privately held land was developed in an overall manner for lease or sale, although large segments were (and still are) owned by the railways.

A Successful Public Venture.

In development and use Granville island stands in marked contrast to the railway lands. The island, reclamation of which began in 1916, was wholly under lease by 1923.\(^{11}\) The work of reclaiming it was taken directly to completion through the expenditure of public funds. The island was then put in the hands\(^{12}\) of a semi-public agency (the harbour board

---

\(^{11}\) Vancouver Harbour Commission, *Report*, 1926, p.10
\(^{12}\) See page 102.
was incorporated by federal statute, but its members were appointed by the governor-general-in-council) for lease to occupants. In the instance of the east-end reclamation the initiative for making the land available for private development was left to the railways and before they could attract businesses a good deal of costly filling and utility provision were needed. While there were no deterrents to the harbour board, the railway faced additional expense which would only have been warranted if the land could have been sold or leased to businesses requiring railway services.

In the case of Granville island the public purpose was to create an area suitable for industrial development. The end was in view when the project was begun. There was planning involved, albeit only for the immediate area (rather than as part of the over-all waterway or city development). The east-end reclamation was a mixed undertaking where the public policy was merely conveniently to dispose of the material dredged from the channel. There had not even been an estimate of whether the whole area could thereby be filled (as matters turned out, it was not completely filled and the problem of finishing it was one of controversy and contention between the city and the railways for a number of years). Nor was the area integrated with, or related in any way to, the immediately surrounding lands, as might have been done under a development plan. The scheme was an ad hoc arrangement between the city, the Canadian Northern, and the dredgers. Its completion was
subsequently impeded by the unfortunate financial vicissitudes which the railway experienced soon after the agreement with the city was completed.\textsuperscript{13}

The different courses followed in these two areas can serve as a guide for any future proposals or plans to improve the waterway and its basin. To be effective and to maximize the economic opportunities offered by the waterway, the railways, and the highly desirable industrial location, comprehensively planned public works are almost a necessity, particularly if the scheme is to be both large and self-liquidating. Without planning, small developments will still occur and will achieve a measure of economic use. Development by this method, however, will be slower, less certain, and carry with it the possibility that projects may be undertaken in line with short-term, individual interests contrary to long-term over-all development.

The record of individual enterprise in False Creek has been largely free from detrimental development since the beginning, but there is no assurance that this record will continue. Even after the second World War, when the need for land was so great and the supply so scarce, development undertaken in the False Creek area was never such as would permanently impair any reasonable scheme for the ordering of the channel and improvement of the shore.

Development by individual enterprises could no longer

\textsuperscript{13} See page 84 for arrangements between city and railway.
safely be relied upon (in 1952) for the improvement and enlargement of the industrial and commercial opportunities in the False Creek basin, either on the foreshore or in the transitional residential-industrial zone behind the present developed area. This was so because developments of sufficient size to benefit the economy of the area were ordinarily beyond the scope of private enterprise. Industrial intensification had reached the point where competition for existing space might severely have altered the growth which already had occurred.

3. Administrative Uncertainty.

In the seven years between 1946 and 1952 there was a good deal of talk, some planning, and virtually no action in respect to public development of False Creek.

As far as the waterway was an obstacle, it required a bridge built at a price likely to approach $20 million before completion in 1954. As an area of high potential for industrial use, False Creek brought forth a reaffirmation of the principles embodied in the 1928 Vancouver plan (never implemented), a "False Creek Development Survey," and a scheme for a fish boat mooring basin.

The period began auspiciously with an agreement, between the provincial departments of Public Works, and Lands
and Forests, the city's Board of Works, and the C.P.R., to cooperate in opening the unused land on the north shore of the Creek between Connaught bridge and Georgia viaduct.

All that came out of this agreement, however, was a rough road, which ran northeast-southwest from Connaught bridge to the B.C. Electric's Carrall street yards, thence almost due north to Pender street. It followed approximately the original shore line and divided provincial and railway owned properties. For this reason the railway and the provincial Lands department contributed the necessary right-of-way to the city for the road. The provincial Public Works department contributed $2809 towards the cost of building the road, and this was met by the city, which did the work. Some filling had to be done where the roadway ran adjacent to the B.C. Electric property, and this was done by the provincial government. The C.P.R. permitted a level crossing of its tracks at the extension of Smithe street, but retained title to this portion. The new thoroughfare was named Taylor street (see diagrams, p. 131).14

From the revision of the Vancouver plan in 1948 until early 1950 no action was taken to revise the original plans for False Creek or undertake the special study which would be required to transform the general suggestions to concrete proposals.

The absence of action was due, in part, to a lack of agreement within the Vancouver Town Planning Commission as to what the future role of the waterway and basin should be. Engineering reports had at all times favoured retention of the waterway as a shipping channel, but these were not in line with the general consensus of popular opinion. This difference was reflected in the membership of the commission, and the result was inaction, even in the face of the ever mounting demand of new industrial areas in the city.

New Plans Necessary.

By 1950 action in False Creek, for bridges or filling, could no longer be delayed. Expert outside advice was sought, and Edward L. Cousins, P. Eng., engineer-consultant to the Toronto harbour board, was retained. He made a report to the city council 26, June, 1950 (following an inspection of the waterway) in which he recommended:

1. A thorough study of False Creek be undertaken.
2. Proposals for total fill be rejected.
3. Railway and terminal facilities of Vancouver and particularly False Creek be studied.
4. Present and future sawmill use of the waterway and basin be given careful study.
5. The problem of relocating Kitsilano trestle be considered.
6. The provision of a mooring area for fish boats be considered.
7. Following these studies and reports, that a comprehensive development plan be drawn for the area with a program for its implementation, based on financial resources and other limiting factors.

15. The Cousins preliminary report has not been published (1953). This information is from a report to the Board of Works, 10, Feb.1953, by the city engineer.
On the basis of this preliminary report, the city council authorized an investigation of the False Creek development project. The city engineer was instructed to set up, within his department, an organization to carry this out, and Mr. Cousins was retained as consultant to the survey. A study of railway and terminal facilities was undertaken almost immediately by D.G. Kilburn, retired chief engineer, federal Department of Transport. The forestry consulting firm of C.D. Schultz & Co., was engaged sometime later to make a study of the wood-converting industries of False Creek. An engineering-assistant-in-charge and an experienced draftsman were assigned the problem (one year and five months later) under the direction of the senior assistant city engineer. Survey work and complete mapping of the waterway and its facilities and development were undertaken and preliminary proposals for development were drawn.

A Political Issue.

In the meantime, the development of False Creek became an election issue in local politics. In the mayoralty race of 1950 Fred Hume included in his platform a plank which

16. Made to the city engineer November, 1951, not released (1953) for publication.
17. Made to city engineer, October, 1952, not released (1953) for publication.
advocated the filling-in of the False Creek waterway. He combined this with opposition to the spending of $10 million (as was then estimated, the cost subsequently nearly doubling) for a new bridge at Granville street. He was elected and took office in January, 1951.

As mayor he sought to prevent the awarding of the Granville bridge contract, but was prevailed upon to abandon this stand, and urged to withhold his filling-in proposals until the False Creek Development Survey could be started.

In the summer of 1952 the writer was engaged to estimate the non-engineering costs of implementing preliminary development proposals drawn by the survey, and to estimate the value of land reclaimed in implementing these schemes. All involved some measure of reclamation, and were more or less a stage-by-stage progression towards a completed project very much like the 1929 proposals. These schemes, however, were rejected, in the summer of 1952, by Mr. Kilburn, the city's Lands Department, and the assistant engineer, as being incomplete and inaccurate. The writer was also given the task of extending, in a general way, the Schultz survey of the wood-converting industries to the remainder of the survey-area. However, the Schultz report, due in June, was not received until October. As a result neither of these tasks could be performed, and it was decided instead that a business-by-business survey of the industries in the area should be under-

taken jointly by the writer and a member of the office of the Industrial Commissioner. This was completed in December, 1953.

A Time-Consuming Effort.

The False Creek Development Survey, thirty months after it was authorized by the city council and almost three years after its consultant, E.L. Cousins, had begun his first investigation of the area, was remarkable for two reasons. In the first place a great deal of time elapsed without any proposals being made. Secondly, no effort had been made during this time, either formally or informally, to associate the provincial government, the C.P.R., or the federal government with whatever program of development was likely to emerge. Informal contact was maintained with both the C.P.R. and the National Harbours Board Vancouver office, but only to obtain information from them. They were not kept informed of the proposals emerging, nor was their participation sought in the formulation of these proposals.

At the beginning of his second term of office Mayor Hume, in his inaugural message, announced that he was sending the city engineer (together with the assistant engineer responsible for the False Creek Development Survey) to Toronto to consult with Mr. Cousins (who had, because of ill health, been unable to report to the council during the two and a half years since he was retained to bring about a development plan).19

19. The city engineer brought back, from Mr. Cousins, the recommendation that the studies be continued, that the
Federal Government Action.

Once again, during this period, the vacant Indian reserve land near the entrance to False Creek, provoked development proposals. This time they came from an alderman, 1950-52 chairman of the council's Committee on Harbours, Industries, and Parks,20 who proposed the area as a site for the fish-boat mooring accommodation demanded by the fish-boat owners, and suggested by Mr. H. L. Cousins.

He undertook informal negotiations, first with the provincial Department of Lands and Forests, and then with the federal government, through first the member for Vancouver Centre21 (the B.C. member of the cabinet responsible for mainland affairs) and later the Minister of Fisheries, member for Vancouver Capilano.22 The federal government had adopted the policy, since the war, of being willing to dispose of the remaining reserve land, provided it could obtain the price required to meet its obligations to the Indians and the reversionary claims of the province. The only purchaser able and willing to meet this price was itself, and the land was transferred from the trusteeship of the Indian Affairs Branch to economic and industrial study be extended, that the channel between Granville island and the south shore be filled in, and that discussions be commenced at once with the provincial and federal governments (the National Harbours Board acting for the latter), and the C.P.R. (Vancouver, Board of Works, Report by the City Engineer, op.cit.)

the ownership of the Department of Fisheries.\textsuperscript{23}

This latest action by the federal government in (the matter of) False Creek deserved the same criticism as has been directed against many of its actions in the past. The city had in progress, albeit extremely slowly and uncertainly, a development survey of the False Creek waterway. The consultant to this survey had recommended consideration be given to the feasibility of locating a fish-boat mooring basin in the False Creek area. The proper course of action by the senior government was to approach the fish-boat dock question through, or at least in company with, the city's survey group. No evidence was found, in this study, of any approach to either the development survey staff or the city's planning department as to the suitability or advisability of the proposed development.

Once more, the record for this period shows considerable inaction or indifference on the part of administrative agencies in the matter of False Creek development. The city was too slow in its activity, the federal government too fast, and action by the latter possibly hampering or impairing action by the former. No means appears in 1953 to integrate these two administrative approaches to what is essentially one problem.

\textsuperscript{23} As a result of the efforts of Alderman Wilson, pressure from the Fish-Boat Owners Association, and the imminence of a federal general election, the Minister of Fisheries announced in July, 1953, that a basin for fish-boats would be built at the site of the Indian reserve, and that, upon completion, it would be turned over to the city to operate.
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Chapter Ten: Conclusion

What Lies Ahead.

In the preceding chapters an account has been given of the history of the False Creek problem, and of the actions taken at the several levels of government to make False Creek less of an obstacle and increase its utility as an industrial area.

This two-fold problem has always been a challenge, and from time to time men have sought its solution in plans for both large and small scale public and private developments. But the challenge was never effectively met at the administrative level, and the plans rarely became working projects. Much has been done by the federal, provincial and city governments to solve the False Creek problem, but rarely as the outcome of well-considered planning. As a result, undertakings were individually carried out at one administrative level which might better have been cooperative efforts of all levels, and the effect was piecemeal where it should have been comprehensive. Because of the rapid growth of Vancouver, and the slower development of its central waterway and basin, False Creek is more of a problem in 1953 than it ever has been.

To the extent that the False Creek problem is that of over-
coming an obstacle, responsibility for its solution has unquestionably been a public one. There has never been any substantial or certain opinion, however, as to whether the problem of developing the waterway and basin, so as to maximize its industrial use, is primarily a public or private responsibility.

Ever since the First World War interrupted the implementation of the Swan plan (for dredging a 600-foot channel, cribbing its sides, and back-filling) a body of opinion has favoured public development. The only step achieved in that direction, however, was the reclamation of Granville island.

On the other hand, responsibility for developing the area east of Main street was assigned to, and accepted by, private enterprises, although they received substantial and gratuitous help from the public dredging then being done. This achievement has furthered the opinion that private enterprise, with a small measure of public assistance and a large measure of public control1 (through navigation, headline, zoning, building and use regulations), would best achieve the ends sought.

Meanwhile, all development has, since 1918, been left wholly to private enterprises, less through positive policy, however, than by mere default resulting from administrative uncertainty and inaction.

1. The responsibilities of the railways, in developing the east end flats, were carefully set out in the agreements by which they obtained the land.
1. Fifty Years of Surveys and Reports.

The first survey of the False Creek area was that of the C.P.R., and it recommended the deepsea terminal and yards be located on the Kitsilano peninsula. The plan for this was never published, however, nor was it ever a basis for proposed public action.

The first proposal recommending government works appeared in the early years of the twentieth century, and was one of many boom-provoked schemes. Its origin could not be learned in the course of this study, but it did appear to have the support of the city engineer of the time, Col. T.H. Tracy.² The idea was to dredge the area east of Main street, which was then largely tidal flats, and construct there a shipping basin for shallow and medium draught vessels. The scheme never gained sufficient popular support and was dropped when the area in question was granted to the Canadian Northern Railway for terminal development.

At about the same time, there appears to have been a private plan for dock and terminal development on the mud flats where Granville island is now located. A lease or grant of the area was sought by a group of local men, but the scheme was discredited as being a political "deal", and came to an end with

² Roy W. Brown, interview with the author, 14 Feb., 1953
the change of federal governments in 1911. The federal government, in the same period, had soundings made of the channel and shore by its engineers and this work was followed, in 1912, by the report of the Montreal civil engineer, A.D. Swan, on Vancouver harbour, in which it was recommended that the False Creek channel be narrowed and deepened and the residual area reclaimed. Action to implement this scheme was begun in 1913 with the dredging of the channel. The federal government intended to complete the project but war conditions prevented this.

Private Scheme Halted.

The First World War also halted a proposal of the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific Railway to acquire the Indian reserve land on the Kitsilano peninsula for terminal purposes. Government seizure of U.S. railways nullified the agreement which had been entered into by the railway, the harbour commission, and the Indian Affairs branch of the federal government.

In 1919 A.D. Swan once more reported on Vancouver's harbour needs. He recommended reclamation of the False Creek foreshore and also proposed a deep-sea ship and rail terminal for the Kitsilano peninsula much like that planned by the Milwaukee Road. The harbour commission favoured the idea, but

---

the 1921 election of a new federal government changed the commission and its plans.

In 1927 the whole False Creek area was given careful consideration in reports on Vancouver's harbour and transportation by A.R. Mackenzie and W.D. Hudson, and their recommendations for developing the waterway were made a part of the Vancouver city plan of 1928. The proposal followed closely Swan's basic idea - a bulkheaded channel (400-600 feet wide) with reclamation of the foreshore. Unlike the Swan plan, however, the 1928 proposal was carefully integrated with the city's street and bridge pattern. It also proposed the joining of Granville island to the mainland on the west and south, and the elimination of the Kitsilano trestle and the C.P.R. yards on the north shore. Included were proposals for several new crossings of the waterway, one of which, at Burrard street, was the only proposal to become a reality in the course of the following 25 years.

No new over-all plan for the area has been presented since. There have been, however, a number of surveys undertaken which have touched upon the False Creek problem in one way or another. In 1932 Sir Alexander Gibb, an English harbour engineer and administrator, made his *National Ports*

4. Engineer for the Vancouver Town Planning Commission.
5. Associate engineer, Harland Bartholomew and Associates, town planning consultants.
Survey. He mentioned False Creek only in passing, referring to its high degree of industrialization and great importance to the port of Vancouver. His observations lent weight to the contention that a complete fill of False Creek would not be in the best commercial and industrial interests of the city.

False Creek Development Survey, 1950

No new surveys were undertaken, or reports or recommendations made during the depression and war periods. In 1950, after some wrangles between the city council and the town planning commission over the advisability of re-proposing the original 1928 plan for False Creek development, the city council asked E.L. Cousins, Toronto harbour engineer, to advise the city on a course of action regarding False Creek. May 12, 1950, Mr. Cousins suggested that a full survey of the waterway be made by a staff from the city hall. This recommendation was accepted, and Mr. Cousins retained as consultant to the "False Creek Development Survey", as it was named. In addition, he advised

6. Sir Alexander was primarily concerned with the national harbour problem and the financial distress in which all harbour boards then found themselves. Out of his recommendations came the National Harbours Board in 1936, replacing inter alia the Vancouver Harbour Commission.

7. What was described as "a complete engineering survey of the False Creek sector" (Vancouver Province, 18 April, 1939, p.2) was authorized in April, 1939. Attempts to have the senior governments participate delayed its start until hostilities finally prevented it.
special reports on the railway situation, the sawmill situation, and the economic condition of False Creek industry. A good deal of basic survey work was performed and mapped by the survey staff, and reports were submitted on railways,\(^8\) the sawmills,\(^9\) and the economic and industrial condition of the waterway and its industries.\(^10\)

Three years after it was authorized by the city council, and 20 months after it began its work, the False Creek Development Survey was discontinued. It had amassed all possible data but found itself with nothing to recommend. The horns of the dilemma which caught it were, first, an inability to make any substantial improvements in the development plans long since proposed, and, second, an unwillingness to propose again what had in the past proven unachievable.

The aim of the survey appears to have been the detailed planning of waterway development - for which the time was not ripe. The most that any engineering plan could hope to do was a general revision of the already proposed scheme for development, in terms of the changes in the over-all needs of the city for both new industrial land and more adequate crossings.

---


The survey seems to have fallen over the stumbling block which had tripped all previous attempts to obtain a feasible development program. A plan, no matter how realistic in an engineering way, can have small chance of materializing if it is administratively unrealistic. Because all the False Creek planning up to 1953 was directed solely at solving engineering problems, to the virtual exclusion of any consideration of the administrative problems, the well-engineered cart was always in front of the political horse. Until a solution to the administrative difficulties is found, there appears to be but slight chance of any comprehensive development plan being implemented. Meanwhile the undertakings open to the city will be limited to piecemeal projects with hardly more than accidental relationships to the over-all needs of the waterway.

2. Land Scarcity and Development

In the post-World War II period Vancouver faced, for the

11. In an effort to keep away from problems of a non-engineering sort, the limits of the 1950-53 survey were set at the first property line behind the shore of the 110-foot (city datum) contour line. (see note p. ). This narrow limit made almost impossible any relationship between proposed developments and existing city development, and only one proposal emerged from the survey - to fill-in the channel between Granville island and the south shore. (Vancouver Province, 11 Feb., 1953, p.21) Even this small project appears (Oct. 1953) to have been abandoned.
first time, a scarcity of land suited to industrial use. The Swan plan of 1912 and the Bartholemew plan of 1928 (both of which proposed narrowing the existing waterway by reclaiming the undredged foreshore) if implemented, would have made available between 150 and 200 acres. If the areas in the False Creek basin, zoned since 1928 for industry but largely occupied by residences, were replotted, an additional 50 acres could be made available. If the Bartholomew proposal that C.P.R. yard activities on the north shore between Granville and Connaught bridges be discontinued, then an additional 25 acres would become available from existing land.

The resubdivision of the areas presently zoned, but not well subdivided, for industry could be undertaken by the city administration if the area redevelopment provisions of the National Housing Act apply to this sort of project. Otherwise such action would likely be beyond the financial ability of the city on its own resources. A change in use of the C.P.R. yard area on the north shore could be undertaken by the railway. Whether the company would do so can only be surmised,

12. "Intensive railway activity along the north shore of False Creek, between Pender and Granville streets, is not conducive to civic development, and much work performed here may to advantage be transferred to other localities. "Railroad operations should be limited to service to the industries and warehouses in the False Creek district." (Vancouver Town Planning Commission, A Plan for Vancouver, 1928, p.141.)

13. Canada, Statutes, 1953, c. 42 s.36
but it can certainly be said that the railway would not make the move voluntarily unless its need for yard area decreased and it saw industrial development as a profitable alternative to the present use.\textsuperscript{14}

The construction of a bulk-headed channel, the backfilling of the foreshore behind it, and the acquisition or relocation of the shore establishments detrimentally affected by such work, is probably well outside the financial competence of the city and might even be beyond its statutory powers. Such an undertaking would necessitate either joint administrative action by the three levels of government; or surrender to the city of the False Creek interests of the two senior governments along with statutory powers to undertake the work; or the formation of a statutory corporation representative of the three public levels, together with private interests (principally the railways) and empowered to expropriate lands and borrow money against its credit.

3. A Proposed Course of Action

If further development of the False Creek waterway and

\textsuperscript{14} Formation of a terminal railway company to perform all switching in the Vancouver area has been proposed, along with removal of the major yard activities to Coquitlam. The immediate need for this was seriously questioned by D.J. Kilburn in a 1951 \textit{Interim Report} (unpublished) to the City Engineer.
basin is to take place, there must be a strong public desire for it, a plan of what is to be done there, sufficient authority to carry out the development, and finally there must be money (or credit) to pay for the development.

In 1952 there was among Vancouver residents a wide-spread and long-felt idea that the waterway could and should be cleaned up. Some of this feeling extended to the belief that the waterway should be filled in. This latter idea (the writer believes) was erroneous and uninformed. Its prevalence arose from the fact that information about False Creek had been purposely kept from publication by the fear that development of the waterway might have become a "political football".

The public ignorance about False Creek that resulted from this policy made False Creek far more likely to be an unreasoned political issue than if the needs and potentials of the waterway had been given careful, factual and wide publicity. The people of Vancouver have been largely ignorant of the meaning and importance of the waterway to their individual and civic welfare. The first responsibility of any agency charged improving the basin will be to inform the public of what the waterway and its industrial land mean to them.

Next, the public must be told, in general terms, what can and should be done in the False Creek basin. As this depends largely on what administrative arrangements can be concluded, any proposal will be tentative, and expressed as several alter-
natives. Properly it should follow settlement of the adminis-
trative side, but popular support can only be mustered for a pro-
posal which can be concretely dealt with. The need, then,
will be to revise the Swan and Bartholemew (1928) proposals,
with alternative developments for such difficulties as may elude solution, such as the location of the railway crossing,
future use of the C.P.R. yards, ownership of Granville island,
and inclusion of the area east of Main street. There is in-
formation enough at hand with the False Creek Development Survey
to do this.

Authority to develop comprehensively the False Creek area has never been clearly defined or established. Without author-
ity there has also been an absence of power — in terms of money or credit — to undertake any large scale new works or redevelop-
ment. In the same sense that parliament "can do anything except make a man a woman", authority exists to fill or dredge False Creek, expropriate and redevelop its land, and direct it into uses necessary for the community. Because of the federal nature of the Canadian state, that authority resides with either the central or provincial governments (but not both\textsuperscript{15}). The recognition by both the federal and B.C. governments in 1924 that False Creek is not a "public harbour" in the meaning of the Third Schedule to the British North America Act, and hence not

\textsuperscript{15} In matters such as agriculture and immigration there are concurrent powers.
the property of Canada, relegates the area to the class of "Local Works and Undertakings" and "Property and Civil Rights" which are, by Section 92 of the same Act, the responsibility of the province. Such being the case the Legislative Assembly of B.C. can make statutory provisions for False Creek development of any magnitude, with implementation limited only by the funds or credit available.

Provincial Authority.

Accepting the authority for development as being with the provincial government, the next question is the means by which this power should be exercised. The practice of the government has been to refrain from major works or undertakings located within a municipality, unless such are necessary for the general well-being of the province and by their nature unsuited to civic development. It is unlikely that False Creek could be so categorized. Alternatives to development by the province through its departmental machinery are the vesting, by statute, of the provincial powers in a municipal corporation (in this case Vancouver) or the legislative creation of a statutory authority endowed with the necessary powers.

In as much as the agency undertaking the development work would almost certainly have to borrow money for its proposed works, a problem would arise if it were a municipal corporation. Civic borrowing generally falls short of the money the council
would like to have for capital expenditures, and hence there is competition among projects, on the basis of public need and popular desire. In the case of Vancouver, it is highly unlikely that, even with the authority to undertake comprehensive development of False Creek, the council would be willing to add sufficiently to the city's debt to raise enough capital to do the work necessary.

On the other hand, a special authority which could assume ownership of the real property in False Creek and contiguous areas, would have sizeable assets against which mortgage debentures could be issued. The acceptability of such securities, and the rate of interest they would have to bear, would depend upon conditions which cannot be fully discussed here. It will be assumed here, however, that such an authority would be under competent direction and control and that its capacity to meet interest and principal would not be speculative beyond that of comparable semi-public agencies. In the event that the city and province were willing to guarantee its borrowings, its position would be correspondingly improved.

A Mixed Undertaking.

It would be well if the authority came into possession of the False Creek assets of both the province and the city at the beginning, and that these governments held common stock in the corporation on the basis of the value of the assets surrendered.
The remaining properties could be acquired in at least two ways. The conventional method would be through expropriation, payments for the lands acquired being made from borrowed capital.

Another course suggests itself, however, although it is less conventional. If the provincial legislature were willing to do so, it could empower the False Creek authority to offer stock of the corporation, rather than cash, for expropriated properties. If such were done the former property owners would own the corporation's stock in the same proportion as the value of their original holdings bore to the over-all value of the corporation's holdings. Such an authority would be in the nature of a "mixed undertaking", and its control would be divided between public and private owners.

Management of the authority might be vested in a board of directors, elected by the stock holders. It would almost certainly be desirable for the members elected by public bodies - that is the city and the province - to have a voting control in decisions as to proposed undertakings of the authority. At the same time the private owners would deserve to have their equity protected, and a reasonable guarantee of a return on that equity. These two conditions could possibly be achieved by having, say, 60% of the voting strength controlled by the city and the province (divided between them on the basis of their property values). Decisions as to the nature of works to be undertaken by the authority could be carried by a simple majority, but decisions likely
to affect the assets or earning powers of the corporation could require a two-thirds majority. In this way the public control of the over-all development of the area would be preserved, while the private owners would be protected from a dissipation of their equity. There should also be provision for the authority to pay a reasonable and fair interest on the value of the land taken.

Such a "mixed undertaking" would have several advantages. In the first place there would be, perhaps, less displacement of present False Creek business owners than might happen if purchase were outright. Secondly, some of the control of the corporation, at least, would be representative of private interests, which might relieve it of criticisms often directed against purely governmental agencies, and might also be a restraint


Additional references will be found in the bibliography of Public authorities in the states, Council of State Governments, Chicago, 1953.
against any effort to introduce politics or patronage into the agency. Thirdly, such a mixed undertaking would remove the necessity of heavy borrowings to finance expropriations, and would permit the offering of debentures for development expenditures in a market not already surfeited with the authority's paper. Finally, if the common stock was permitted to be traded in the securities market, its trading price would be a constant reflection of the success of the authority.

Private Owners

There is no way to foretell what would be the reaction of the large private holders - the C.P.R. and the B.C. Electric, if the authority extended only to Main street; the C.N.R. and G.N.R. as well if it included the whole basin - to such a proposal. They would be surrendering absolute control of large segments of the industrial basin in return for a much more limited control of the authority owning the entire basin. On the one hand they might profit substantially from the over-all development not possible before. On the other they might feel that they were surrendering something of substantial market value - the real property - in return for, first, stock of uncertain future value and, second, public control of their property which might eventually be contrary to their best interests. From the information at hand it appears safe to say that a reasonable case could be made for both sides of this unconventional
proposal. It does not seem likely that the B.C. Electric and the one (or three) railway(s) would enter the arrangement without substantial reservations. On the other hand, it also appears, from this study, that Vancouver is in very real need of comprehensive development of False Creek.

Legislative action of the kind suggested here might be labelled confiscatory, but there is a very real public need for something closely akin to the foregoing proposal. Its justification would have to be in provisions, mandatory on the authority, to insure that neither would the expropriated equity of the private owners depreciate in value when converted into the common stock of the authority, nor would their normal business processes be impaired. A sincere effort to protect the interests of private owners would be a first necessity and might succeed in making the proposal acceptable.

The Federal Government.

No mention has yet been made of the two holdings of the federal government in False Creek. In the first place, the federal crown could not be legislated into the corporation, in the same way that private holders could. Secondly, the presence of two senior governments on the corporation's controlling board would be less advantageous than just one. Organization and operation of the authority would be much easier if some means
were found whereby the federal government might give up its holdings in False Creek, either by sale or by other arrangement.17

If the city were to come into possession of the reserve land and Granville island in any way, these areas would be included in the assets surrendered by the city to the development authority. Also, such a transfer of ownership would leave the federal government with only an interest in the navigable provisions of the waterway and without any real property there.

4. Stalemate.

The city abandoned, in 1953, the "False Creek Development Survey" which was authorized in 1950 and begun in 1951. The survey was unable to present any plan for development which would have been economically and politically attractive to the city council. The likelihood of provincial action in False Creek, other than a possible particular development of some area of the bed or foreshore owned by it, is slight. The federal government is about to undertake (1953) the construction of a fishboat mooring basin in a part of the waterway, but which is unrelated

17. Such a possibility exists in 1953-54, but it will not long remain. See Appendix B.
to any over-all development for the waterway or its contiguous industrial areas.

At the same time as public action seems to be outside the competence or interest of any one level of government, there is a growing need for the sort of industrial land which development of the False Creek basin would produce. The development of such industrial land by private enterprises can only be done in a very piece-meal way, if at all.

The waterway and basin are in greater need of comprehensive development than ever before. No action seems likely or perhaps even possible through the methods which in the past have produced uncertain, unplanned, but nevertheless reasonably effective changes. The alternative to no development seems only to be the creation of an effective and competent statutory agency by the provincial legislature, with both power and authority to undertake and carry out the needed development of this industrial area so important to the city of Vancouver.
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An Act to Incorporate the Vancouver Harbour Commission. (1913)

Sec. 4 For the purposes of this Act the harbour shall include Burrard Inlet with * * * False Creek and all other tidal waters lying east of a line drawn from Point Atkinson Lighthouse southerly to the most westerly point of Point Grey.

Sec. 11 The Corporation shall, for the purposes of this Act, have jurisdiction within the limits of the harbour.

Sec. 12 The Corporation may acquire, expropriate, hold, sell, or lease and otherwise dispose of such real estate * * * as it deems necessary or desirable for the development, improvement * * * of the harbour.

Sec. 14 All lands and interests in lands within the limits of the harbour, and heretofore vested in His Majesty in the right of Canada, shall * * * be vested in and held by the Corporation for the purposes of this Act; * * * provided that * * * every five years * * * His Majesty in the right of Canada may become repossessed of the said lands and interests in lands * * *.

2. The Corporation may * * * convey any portion of the said lands or interest in lands, but no conveyance shall be for a longer term than twenty-one years.

Sec. 19 The Corporation may make by-laws for the following purposes:

(q) The expropriation and acquisition of such real property as the Corporation deems necessary for the construction of wet and dry docks, warehouses, elevators, and railways, or otherwise for the general purposes of the Corporation.

Ottawa
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P.C. 941

At the Government House at Ottawa
Saturday the 7th day of June, 1924

Present: His Excellency the Governor General in Council.

Whereas there has been laid before His Excellency the Governor General in Council a report, dated 27th May, 1924, from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, submitting:

1. That by virtue of section 108, schedule 3, of the British North America Act, and of the order of Her late Majesty in Council dated 16th May, 1871, public harbours in British Columbia became the property of Canada as of the 20th day of July, A.D. 1871.

2. That some doubt has existed as to what is comprised in the expression 'public harbours' in schedule 3 of the British North America Act, and it has been held by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council that the question whether any harbour or any particular part thereof is included is a question of fact dependent upon the circumstances of each case, but that a natural harbour not actually used for harbour purposes at the date of the Union is not included.

3. That it is desirable in the public interest that the property which belongs to Canada under the designation 'public harbours' should be definitively ascertained, and negotiations have accordingly been carried on between the Dominion and Provincial Governments with a view to reaching a settlement of all outstanding questions between the two governments in this connection, and agreeing upon certain defined areas as being the property of Canada under said designation.

4. That as the result of conferences between the representatives of the two governments it has been mutually agreed that the harbours of Victoria, Esquimalt, Nanaimo, Alberni, Burrard Inlet, and New Westminster * * * were and are public harbours within the meaning of schedule 3 of the British North America Act and became and are the property of Canada thereunder.

5. That it has been further agreed between the two governments that the ownership of all other ungranted foreshore of tidal or non-tidal waters and lands covered with water in British Columbia, except any foreshore and lands covered with water within the Railway Belt, belonging to and are vested in the Province.

6. That it has been further agreed that any grants or transfers by one government to the other shall not be affected by this Order, and all such grants and transfers which may have been made prior to the date hereof shall be ratified and confirmed by this Order, and moreover, that nothing herein contained shall affect the title of the Dominion to any lands or properties
acquired under any other provision of the British North America Act, or otherwise than by virtue of the designation 'public harbours' in the said Act.

7. That it has been further agreed that where the Dominion Government has prior to the date of this Order treated as a public harbour a harbour other than the six harbours specified the Government of the Province of British Columbia will consider the transfer of such part or parts of such harbours as may reasonably be required by the Dominion Government for public purposes.

8. That the Province will set aside certain sites which have already been occupied by the Dominion Government for the purpose of marine administration, and will set aside from time to time such further sites as may reasonably by required by the Dominion for such purposes.

* * *

11. That * * * where the Dominion Government has heretofore granted, quit-claimed, leased, or otherwise dealt with any foreshore or lands covered with water located outside the boundaries of the six harbours aforesaid * * * the same shall be confirmed by the Province, subject to such terms and conditions as the Province may prescribe.

THEREFORE His Excellency the Governor General, on the recommendation of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, is pleased to order as follows:

(a) The agreement above recited is hereby ratified and confirmed.

(b) All the right, title and interest, if any, of the Dominion in any un-granted foreshore of tidal or non-tidal waters and lands covered with water in British Columbia outside the boundaries of the six harbours above mentioned * * * shall be and the same is hereby transferred to the Province of British Columbia.

(c) A certified copy of this Order shall be transmitted to the Provincial Government and a copy shall be filed * * *.

E.J. Lemieux, Clerk of the Privy Council

From Schedule 'A' to P.C. 941

Burrard Inlet: All the foreshore and bed of Burrard Inlet and the area adjacent to the entrance thereto lying east of a line drawn south astronomically from the south-west corner of the Capilano Indian Reserve Number Five to high water mark of Stanley Park.
APPENDIX C

THIS INDENTURE made the thirty first day of December, 1928, BETWEEN

HIS MAJESTY THE KING, herein represented by the Minister of Lands, for
the Province of British Columbia (hereinafter called the 'Province')
OF THE FIRST PART

AND

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY (hereinafter called the 'Railway
Company')
OF THE SECOND PART

Whereas the Railway is by virtue of a certain Grant from the Crown in
the interest of the Province of British Columbia, the owner of the land
(except streets) along the north and south shores of False Creek in the
City of Vancouver above high water mark (see plan attached to original).

And Whereas the lands (as represented on the attached plan) represent
street ends which it is intended shall not be affected by the present demise.

And Whereas the Province claims that the bed of False Creek below high
water mark is vested in the Crown in the interest of the Province.

And Whereas the Railway Company claims in addition to its right as rip­
arian owner certain rights under clause 18(a) of its charter to take use
and hold the land below high water mark in False Creek for its railway and
other works, and that it has under the said power occupied portions of the
land below high water mark in False Creek.

And Whereas the Crown in the interest of the Dominion of Canada by Let­
ters Patent dated the 17th of March, 1894, granted unto the Railway Company
lands (as represented on the plan attached to original).

And Whereas it is expedient for the Province and the Railway Company to
enter into an arrangement which will induce industrial settlement and give
to the Province compensation for the occupation of the lands (as marked).

And Whereas it has with the object of bringing about the speedy develop­
ment of the said lands been agreed as hereinafter set forth:

NOW THEREFORE THIS INDENTURE WITNESSETH THAT THE PROVINCE AND THE RAIL­
WAY COMPANY AGREE AS FOLLOWS:

1. The Province agrees that the lands designated as Lots 5603, 5605,
4672, 4673, 4678, and 5606, Group 1, New Westminster District, in so far
as they are vested in the Crown in the interest of the Province, be con­
voyed to the Railway Company in consideration of the release mentioned in
the next following clause, subject to certain leases and tenancies par­
ticulars of which are contained in Schedule 'B' hereto.

2. The Railway Company in consideration of the grant mentioned in Clause
one hereby quitclaims, abandons, releases and relinquishes to the Province
any and all rights, which it may have or has had under clause 18(a) of its charter (Chapter One of the Statutes of 1881) to take use and hold land in False Creek below high water mark within the easterly and westerly limits of the lands herein demised, except the lands mentioned in clause one (hereof and the lands granted to the Railway Company by the Crown in the interest of the Dominion of Canada by Letters Patent dated the 17th day of March, 1894, but without prejudice to any right of expropriation under the Railway Act of Canada.)

3. The Province under and by virtue of all the powers thereto enabling agrees to demise and lease and doth hereby demise and lease unto the Railway Company, its successors and assigns, all those pieces or parcels of land designated on the attached plan as lots 3661, 3662, 3663, 3664, 3665, 3666, 4664, 4665, 5604, 4667, 4668, 4669, 4671, 5607, 5318, 3640, 3642, 3644, 3660, 3646, 3648, 3650, 3652, 3654, 4675, and 3656, Group 1, New Westminster District.

TO HOLD the said premises unto the Railway Company, its successors and assigns for the term of twenty-one years from the date hereof, with a right of renewal for a further period of twenty-one years, subject to the tenancies mentioned in the schedule hereto and the conditions and restrictions hereinafter contained and expressed, YIELDING AND PAYING THEREFOR unto His Majesty yearly and every year the rent of one dollar payable on the 31 day of December in each year *** and also paying by way of further or additional rent from time to time a sum equal to the amount received by the Railway Company from its sub-leases under the provisions hereinafter stated.

4. The lands above described shall be sublet by the Railway Company with due diligence and the Railway Company will endeavour to have the same at all times occupied so that the Province will procure from the said lands as favourable a revenue as possible.

5. In order to ensure that in renting lands of the Railway Company and sub-letting to the same tenants part or parts of the lands herein demised, fair comparative rentals shall be charged in respect of the lands of the Railway Company and of the premises herein demised, a comparative valuation of the same has been made. Schedule 'A' sets forth the basis of value mutually arrived at and the basis of rentals to be followed as far as possible.


8. The Railway Company shall pay to the Province all rents actually collected by the Railway Company from its sub-leases in respect of the said lands.

9. & 16. Contain provisions to reimburse the Company for costs, provide the Province only with the net revenue, permit the Company to surrender part or all of the demised parts, and other details of agreement.

16. In order to avoid uncertainty owing to the sinuosity of the shore line as to the boundary between the property of the Province and the property of the Railway Company on the south side of False Creek, it is agreed that the surveyed line shown on the plans referred to in the third recital (?)
shall be deemed to be the said boundary (in lieu of the shore line) between the east side of Lot 3654 and the south boundary of the Indian Reserve as shown in the said plans.

It is further agreed that the surveyed line on the north side of False Creek westerly from the westerly angle of lot 5606 shall for the purposes of the leases to be made of the railway property and of the subleases to be made of the premises herein demised be deemed to be the boundary between the property of the Railway Company and of the Province as far west as the west boundary of Lot 3661.

17. The Railway Company shall as sub-leases are made forward to the Minister a copy of such sub-leases certified by an officer of the Railway Company having authority to do so.

18. The Railway Company shall every three months remit to the Province all moneys in its hands due to the Province hereunder on the * * day of the months of * * * in each year.

Deputy Minister of Lands

Canadian Pacific Railway Company

Schedule 'A': Contains values and rental schedules, largely put aside with the onset of the business depression of the thirties.

True copies of this indenture can be found deposited in the Land Department of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's Vancouver office, and the Department of Lands and Forests, Lands Division, Victoria, B.C. .
APPENDIX D

The Need for a Helicopter Landing Area Close to Downtown Vancouver; and the Possible Advantages that a False Creek Location Might Have.

The utility of helicopters for public passenger travel is, in 1953, an accepted fact. Growing numbers of people and goods are being moved by helicopters in scheduled operation. Rotary wing aircraft are still small in size, but prototypes of larger craft have already been produced.

In December, 1953, a prediction was made by E.B. Schaefer, chief engineer for Canadair, Ltd., that scheduled airline operation of helicopters might reasonably be expected in Canada within 10 years. This was in line with what is being forecast generally. Present expectations are that the helicopter will not replace the conventional airplane as a speedy means of long distance transportation but "will eventually find a definite place in short trips of 200 miles or less."

One third of the traffic from the Vancouver International Airport in 1953 was destined to, or arrived from, points within 200 miles distance. It is reasonable to predict that if the same proportions persist, one third of Vancouver's air traffic may eventually be by helicopters which could, in all probability, use a landing area close to the downtown area. The existence of such a 'heliport' would likely mean that a large part of the remainder, which now requires bus or taxi transportation between the city and the airport could be carried the same distance by shuttle helicopter.

1. New York Airways, Inc., completed in October, 1953, its first year of "helicopter mail, cargo and passenger service operations in metropolitan New York having flown 281,000 miles and gained 4,700 hours of air experience * * *." (New York Times, 15 Nov, 1953, p. X31.)
2. Sabena Airlines (Belgium) instituted in 1953 scheduled helicopter service between Brussels and cities in Belgium, The Netherlands, and West Germany. Fares were competitive with third-class rail service.
3. Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board of B.C., Airports, 1953.
4. This likely outcome of helicopter service -- the transportation of air passengers from downtown to airport by air with the virtual elimination of the city's need for a bridge across the north arm of the Fraser river at Marpole -- will remove or substantially diminish the city's responsibility for assuming a share of the cost of a new bridge.
The helicopters of 1953, and those being planned for operational use in the immediate future, can operate successfully from the same amount of space required for a bus depot or, more precisely, an area not any larger than a city block and in certain special instances from building roofs. While space is not therefore a seriously limiting factor on helicopter operations into the downtown area, noise is. Until such time as rotary wing aircraft become much quieter, heavy traffic in the vicinity of residential or office areas will not be possible.

False Creek, then, deserves consideration and close survey with a view to determining the suitability of its shores for helicopter landing-field sites. For one thing, approaches to it can be made over water or industrial areas and there are sections where "heliport" developments would be remote from residential or business districts. For another, there are sections of both shore and foreshore not at present occupied and where future development might be made for heliports or in keeping with what their needs will be.

It is not the purpose here to propose any site or sites, or even to pass on the over-all suitability of the False Creek basin, for landing areas for rotary-wing aircraft. There are other factors, such as weather, which could weigh against it and which cannot be considered here. Nevertheless, the time is imminent for the city to consider the setting aside of one or more landing areas close to the downtown section of the city. The undeveloped nature of certain parts of False Creek places it high on any list of areas worth considering.

In the absence of any technical evaluation, the north shore area west of Connaught bridge suggests itself. There is no development of the shore or foreshore and it is almost the same distance from the business district as the bus depot. Access to it might be possible from Connaught bridge by ramps. On the south and west it is bordered by water and by rail yards, and on the north and east by industrial land. The upland part is owned by the C.P.R. and is entirely undeveloped. The foreshore is owned by the provincial government and is also undeveloped.

7. A helicopter landing field, opened in London in 1952, had to be abandoned because of the noise problem. Rooftop landings are restricted, not only by the noise factor, but also because of the fire hazard in refueling.
APPENDIX E

A Proposed Course of Action for Vancouver in Respect to Federally-Owned Land in the False Creek Area; with an Outline of Recommended Development Which Would Then Be Possible.

In the False Creek basin the federal crown owns 34-acre Granville Island and 49 acres of former Indian reserve land on the south shore of the False Creek entrance. Granville Island is developed with roads and track-age, and is entirely under 21-year leases to industries. It is managed by the Vancouver office of the National Harbours Board for the federal crown.

The 35 acres of former Indian land, north and west of Burrard bridge, are held by the National Defense department as an air force depot. Most of this parcel is developed with roads, trackage, warehouses, offices and personnel quarters. At the end of 1953 active use was limited to reserve force training and living quarters.1

Fish Boat Basin Scheme

East and north of the B.C. Electric (V. & L.I.) R.R. track are 11 undeveloped acres, portions of which are heavily covered with sawdust and mill waste. In 1953 this area was transferred from the Indian Affairs Branch to the Fisheries department,2 with the announced intention by the federal government of the construction of docks and a mooring basin on the foreshore (some 15 or 20 acres) and the necessary shore appurtenances

1. The depot land is in a residentially-zoned part of the city. Use as a depot is possible only because of the immunity of the crown from local ordinances. If the government ever disposes of it to private enterprise, a not unlikely event, continued commercial or industrial use may be forbidden by the city, or restricted to the provisions of non-conforming uses. At the same time pressure might be put on the city to re-zone the area, or relief might be sought in the courts.
2. The 13 acres south of the track, originally part of the reserve, were first alienated to the National Defense department before and during the second World War. In 1947 all except the site of the Seaforth armories were sold to a brewery. A 2.2-acre triangle between Burrard bridge, Chestnut street, and the C.P.R. right-of-way is all that remains with the Indian Affairs Branch.
on the upland area. The former belongs to the province whose consent, if not already given, would be necessary before any such development could be undertaken.

The fish boat basin proposals have never been submitted by the federal government to the city council or its planning department for joint consultation. The evidence so far made public suggests that the federal action, announced just prior to the 1953 federal election and perhaps prompted by that event, was virtually unilateral. Primary stimulus for the fish boat basin scheme came, inter alios, from the Fishing Vessel Owners Association and H.D. Wilson, at that time an alderman of Vancouver.3

Best Economic Use

Utilization of the 11 acres of upland and 20-odd acres of foreshore as a fish boat basin would be highly uneconomic not only in itself, but when compared with alternative possible uses. The land in question is skirted on two sides by railway trackage, recommending it for industrial uses. If the foreshore were reclaimed to the channel line (more or less formed by the main piers of Burrard and Granville bridges) the result would be most salutary in both improved appearance and industrial potential.

Some 20 to 25 acres of industrially desirable land could be reclaimed in this area. With the undeveloped reserve land one would then have a 35-40 acre tract, and a 75-acre tract if the air force depot were also made a part of it. All of it would be level and easily served by rail sidings and roads. It would have 1200 feet of channel-line shore which could be increased by slips and mooring quays. The reclaimed area would adjoin Granville island and could relieve the serious traffic problem on the island.

To the south of the proposed development area is the badly blighted section east of Burrard street. This eight-block, run-down area, although long zoned for industry, has a record of general deterioration. Its position would permit its development as part of the larger scheme (it is one of the sections which the city planning department recommended in 1953 for redevelopment). With its present pattern of streets and subdivision abandoned, and made a part of a large scale redevelopment, it would have high promise of valuable industrial development.

---

3. Alderman Wilson did not represent the Vancouver city council officially in his approaches to the senior governments in this matter. It is not a matter of record whether the council ever formally endorsed the scheme or, for that matter, ever disapproved of it.
If such proposals as the foregoing merit consideration, their fulfillment will depend on two important steps being taken. First and most urgent would be aggressive and forthright action by the city to acquire control of the land in this area, otherwise it likely will be disposed of haphazardly and its high industrial potential dissipated. The record of federal action in False Creek does not encourage confidence that development or disposition of crown land there will be in the over-all interest of either the waterway or the city generally. Secondly, any comprehensive development of the waterway will need organization and capital. In all probability a statutory agency, a corporate body with borrowing powers as is a crown corporation, as outlined in chapter 10, would be best suited to handle such a program of financing and development.

The city's need for industrial land with rail and water access is urgent enough, however, that alternative opportunities should not be turned down if some form of development authority or "mixed undertaking" does not seem feasible. Because the administration of the City of Vancouver is not at present organized to handle large scale real estate developments, and because an elected body is not always the most satisfactory agent itself to undertake a program of the scope recommended here, a special authority responsible to the city, or to the city and the province, but with the status and autonomy of a crown corporation, might be more preferable.

Acquisition of the Land

The writer is of the opinion that a way lies open in 1954 for the city of Vancouver to acquire, by a reasonable exchange, the federally-owned properties in the False Creek basin. The federal government, through the Transport department, has offered the city $1 million for the city-owned airport.4 It is suggested here that the city should accept, in payment for the airport, the title to Granville island, the 35-acre inactive air force depot, the 11 undeveloped acres proposed for the fish boat basin scheme. The city should also ask that the federal government undertake, in lieu of the fish boat basin in False Creek, the development of Coal Harbour jointly with the Vancouver Parks Board, to provide mooring facilities for all types of small craft, including fish boats.

Granville island is under the management of the National Harbours Board which is in turn under the jurisdiction of the Transport department. The assessed value of Granville island land (without improvements) was $431 thousand (1952). The assessed value of the air force depot land was $248 thousand (1953). The undeveloped area is of nominal value.

The evidence gathered in both this study and the writer's previous industrial survey demonstrated a) the advantages Vancouver city would derive from developing False Creek according to a comprehensive plan, and b) the difficulty or impossibility of achieving this under the present administrative arrangement of False Creek. The objective here has been to show how False Creek administration might first be simplified and then unified, and, following this, how development on an over-all basis might be started -- either by the city or, preferably, by a statutory corporation perhaps on the order of the English 'mixed undertaking.'

Widening the Area of Development

The south shore property east of Granville bridge as far as Alder street has been only lightly developed in the years up to 1953. It would be both possible and feasible to extend the area already recommended for development so as to include the land between Granville and Alder streets and the railway track and Granville island, eliminating the eastern half of the heavily silted south channel.

This would enlarge the area of the suggested industrial 'estate' to about one quarter of a square mile. The assessed value of the land in such a development (but not of improvements) would be over $1.5 million at today's valuations, and the market value might well exceed $2.5 million.\(^5\)

A development of this scope and magnitude offers the only practical way to refurbish an area which is now a hodge-podge of undeveloped public land and poorly subdivided private land and which is constantly the object of public criticism for its run-down appearance. Additional advantages of such an over-all development would be the creation of much-needed industrial land inside the city and, at the same time, its complete separation from the existing city street and traffic pattern.

If these proposals were undertaken as part of a move to establish a statutory development authority for the whole of the False Creek basin, such development would be in keeping with the objects of such a body, they would remove one senior government from the administration of False Creek thereby making it easier for the city to negotiate with the other, and they would increase the city's equity (over what it would otherwise be) in whatever authority was established.

\(^5\) The average assessment of the 26 acres occupied on Granville Is. is $16,500. If the popular but arbitrary assumption that market value is twice assessed is allowed, the former then exceeds $25,000 per acre. If the proposed 'industrial estate' is between 150 and 200 acres, some 100 are likely to bear taxes and have an assessed value (without improvements) of more than $1.6 million and market value of over $2.5 million.
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