Canada, House of Commons, 20th Parl. Sess. 3, Standing Committee on Public Accounts, Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (Kings Printer: Ottawa 1947)

No 4.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

THURSDAY, May 8, 1947.

The Standing Committe on Public Accounts met at 11.30 o'clock a.m., the Vice-Chairman, Mr. Gordon B. Isnor, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Boucher, Burton, Cockeram, Cote (*Verdun*), Cruickshank, Fleming, Gladstone, Golding, Grant, Green, Isnor, Jaenicke, Kirk, Marshall, Pinard, Probe, Raymond (*Wright*), Rinfret, Stewart (*Winnipeg North*), Stuart (*Charlotte*), Thatcher, Warren, Winkler.

In attendance: Dr. E. H. Coleman, C.M.G., K.C., Deputy Custodian of Enemy Property, Mr. F. G. Shears, Director, Vancouver Office, and Mr. K. W. Wright, Counsel.

The Chairman presented the Second Report of the Steering Committee, which is as follows:

Your Steering Committee met on Tuesday, May 6, and begs to present the following as a Second Report:

It is recommended that the Committee proceed immediately with an inquiry into the administration of the Regulations respecting Trading with the Enemy, in accordance with its Order of Reference dated April 30. It is also recommended that the various subjects be dealt with in the following order:

1. Examination of the Officer in charge of the Vancouver office of the Custodian, Mr. F. G. Shears;
2. Review of the administration of the property of illegal organizations;
3. Investigation of the Ottawa office of the Custodian;
4. Examination of the Custodian's accounts.

Mr. Burton moved that a representative of the Cooperative Committee on Japanese Canadians be invited to appear before the Committee.

After discussion, it was agreed that Mr. Burton's motion be referred to the Steering Committee.

Mr. Shears was called, heard and questioned.

Mr. Shears filed a copy of a registration form completed by persons of the Japanese race having property in any protected area, which is printed as *Appendix A* to this day's minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Mr. Shears filed a copy of *Catalogue of Real Property for Sale by Public Tender*, issued by The Custodian, Vancouver, B.C., and dated June 19, 1943.

At 1.00 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned until Friday, May 9, at 11.30 o'clock a.m.

A. L. BURGESS,
Clerk of the Committee.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-1
www.nikkeimuseum.org

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
May 8, 1947.

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts met this day at 11.30 a.m. The Vice-Chairman, Mr. Gordon B. Isnor, presided.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The first order of business today is to receive a report from the steering committee which met on Tuesday, May 6; and I shall ask the clerk to read that report.

(See minutes of proceedings).

Now, gentlemen, it is moved by Mr. Golding and seconded by Mr. Fleming that the report as read be adopted.

Mr. BURTON: Mr. Chairman, I regret that at the meeting of the steering committee I did not have all the information I required, otherwise I would have moved my motion at that time; but with your permission I would like to move now that a representative of the Cooperative Committee on Japanese-Canadians be invited to appear before this Public Accounts committee.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, you have heard the report of the steering committee; is it approved?

Carried.

Now, you have heard Mr. Burton's motion with regard to Japanese-Canadians. Shall we pass that on to the steering committee?

Mr. GOLDING: I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that matters of that kind should be dealt with by the steering committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that is the general procedure.

Mr. FLEMING: Perhaps I am at fault in this matter. As a matter of fact I was late in getting to the meeting of the steering committee; it had just about adjourned; but I was interested in that same question. I have had some communications from that committee. I was tempted to open up the question of how far and in what direction we proposed to go in reference to this present inquiry. It certainly would not be practicable for this committee to undertake a review of individual cases or individual claims of which there must be a great many. In this committee we will have to give some consideration to administration conducted in this matter by the custodian's office, and it may be that we shall have some recommendations to make concerning the treatment of claims that may be made by some of these persons. I know there are some claims in the process of being made and which have been under consideration by the government. What kind of forum should be appointed to deal with such claims, or what should be the scope of the powers of that body is a matter of consideration; but if we can shorten the labours of this committee by having an organized presentation of views on behalf of those who may have been affected by the administration of the custodian's office, I think that would be infinitely better than having a number of individuals come forward with presentations and individual experiences; and others who would not have those views at all.

It seems to me that to achieve a full understanding of this problem we will

OVER

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-2a
www.nikkeimuseum.org

want some presentation of views from people representing the interests we are

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-2b
www.nikkeimuseum.org

concerned with. I think that we will make time in the long run and hear a more complete presentation of the whole case, perhaps, if we invite these organizations to send a representative along to a meeting to put forth their views.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: I think we would be following the general practice if we refer not only this but similar questions to the steering committee. There will be others which we will have to decide; requests with regard to the calling of witnesses. I do not think we are in a position to make that decision until we have heard the statement which will be made by Mr. Shears and others who will appear before the committee, as outlined in the report. Is that agreeable to honourable members?

Mr. BURTON: Mr. Chairman, that will be quite acceptable to me. As I pointed out at the beginning had I had this information at the time I would have made a motion in the steering committee.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, you have heard Mr. Burton's motion. Shall it be referred to the steering committee?

Carried.

Now, following your recommendation of approval I shall call on Mr. Shears as the first witness. You will recall that at our meeting of April 28 we had before us the Secretary of State, Hon. Mr. Gibson, and Dr. E. H. Coleman. Dr. Coleman made a complete statement and a very interesting one, and it was agreed at that time that he be allowed to complete his statement before being questioned. I suggest that we might follow the same procedure now, because it worked so satisfactorily before, and that we allow Mr. Shears to make his statement before we question him. Is that agreeable to the committee?

Carried.

Frank G. Shears, Director of the Office of the Custodian, Vancouver, called:

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, as director of the office of the custodian at Vancouver I am pleased to have an opportunity of presenting a brief summary of the general administration and liquidation of Real Property and of the problems in regard to personal effects of the Japanese who were evacuated from the protected area. It was as a result of the policy of evacuation that the control and management of all property left in the protected area had to be administered by the custodian. The protected area is defined by a government order. Briefly, it extends along the whole of the coastline for several hundred miles and into the interior, roughly bounded by the Cascade mountains. In addition to that it takes in Vancouver island, the Queen Charlotte islands, and other small islands known as the Gulf islands. In that area there were approximately 1,700 parcels of real property which were owned by Japanese or in which the Japanese had an equitable interest; and in addition to that, of course, there were the businesses and household economy of approximately 22,000 Japanese who resided in that area, many of them not living in their own property but in rented homes or in rooms. Many of them were concentrated in small areas as, for instance, in the city of Vancouver, in one particular section. Others lived in fishing villages, for example, Steveston, about twenty miles from Vancouver. Then there was a [illegible] and made their livelihood in the [illegible] on both the north and south sides of the river; and in addition

During the period of evacuation which lasted several months—I think it was September or October before it was really finally completed—there did exist in the minds of the Japanese a considerable amount of confusion; they were not quite sure, so to speak, which way they were going: some of them were reluctant to place their affairs in the hands of the custodian, and quite a number of transactions were arranged by themselves during that period. Many of them had confectionery stores, fruit stores, dry cleaning establishments, dressmaking places, and they considered it desirable in their own interests that they should make their own arrangements for the disposition of their own businesses. Several hundreds of that type of property did change hands by the Japanese own negotiations.

By Mr. Gladstone:

Q. You said September or October; September or October of which year?—A. 1942. The evacuation commenced in March, 1942, but it continued to September and October 1942. I think it is true to say that in that period when many of these Japanese were making such arrangements certain sections of the general public took advantage of the situation and the Japanese disposed of property at prices which probably were not adequate. In any case, up to that point the custodian was not in the picture.

Q. What was the date of Pearl Harbour?—A. December 7, 1941. In order that the custodian might secure correct and adequate information with regard to all this property which was being left in this area a form was prepared for use in registration. I would like you to understand that this registration was not compulsory, it was purely voluntary. The statement made by them reads as follows: "I, the undersigned, hereby voluntarily turn over to the custodian all my property in the protected area as set out above . . ." and it goes on further and says, "I certify that the above information is true and complete and fully discloses all my property of every description in any protected area in British Columbia . . ."

(Form appears as Appendix "A".)

Now, unfortunately, from the custodian's point of view these registrations were not always true, and very often they were not complete. In a considerable number of instances they were certainly not accurate; and for the most part they were all inadequate. That is a fact without a shadow of doubt.

Mr. PINARD: What do you mean when you say they were not true?

The WITNESS: The statements the Japanese made in regard to what property they were leaving, the location and so forth, as subsequent events proved, were not correct. I will not say it was done deliberately; but the information on which the custodian had to base some of his initial work was largely taken from this form, and he was not supplied in many cases with correct and adequate information.

By Mr. Cockeram:

Q. Do you mean a description of the property?—A. Yes, a description of the property that he was leaving in the hands of the custodian.

Q. Does that include personal property?—A. Real property and personal property. There were a few exceptions which I will mention a little later on. Broadly stated, I am speaking of real and personal property.

By Mr. Boucher:

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018.16.1.45.1.3a
www.nikkeimuseum.org

to them there were the Jpz who were located here & there in isolated places throughout the protected area. Now, their property became vested in the custodian, either upon registration by themselves or automatically when they were evacuated and left that protected area.

Q. It did not include money or securities? A. No. As a matter of fact it included money, bonds, stocks, shares, certificates and fishing vessels.

The Vice Chairman: We will have this tabled before us.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-3b
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Mr. FLEMING: Will it be printed in the proceedings?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: If that is the wish of the committee.

The WITNESS: I think, perhaps, you might look at some other exhibits which I have. In regard to real property, gentlemen, the securing of information in regard to same, was not of course particularly difficult. We were able to secure information from the Land Registry offices and municipal authorities, and those departments co-operated in a very fine way. We were able to obtain the necessary information regarding ownership of Japanese real estate.

The first thing which we did was to appoint inspectors who would inspect these properties and make reports to our office. These inspections had to be made in a somewhat rapid and cursory manner, of course, and then, based upon these investigation reports, agents were appointed for the administration of those properties. These Japanese were being moved out of their homes. In some cases they had found a tenant for their property and in some cases they had not. It became one of our first responsibilities to find tenants for those properties and that was done fairly rapidly. There were very few properties that after a medium length of time were not occupied and revenue-bearing. As a matter of fact, the approximate amount of revenues which the custodian has collected from these properties was about $550,000.

There was another type of property which the custodian had to deal with and that was the farms which I have mentioned situated in the Fraser Valley. There were somewhat over 700 of them. The situation was this, that at the time the Japanese were being evacuated the crops were already growing. For the most part these Japanese were members of co-operatives, and with the assistance of the management of these co-operatives the Japanese themselves entered into negotiations with white people under which they leased their farms; these farms were half an acre or one acre or five acres—small farms—berry-growing farms. The Japanese made arrangements to lease their property for one year for an amount including the value of the growing crop. In that way to some extent these farms were protected; but as you can appreciate that type of farm might have rapidly deteriorated, but that condition did not arise—certainly not to the fullest extent because all of these farms were occupied by some white persons who took over after having made some arrangement with the Japanese through the co-operatives in which they were interested. The Japanese usually received some cash payments and the balance was all collected by the custodian subsequent to the owners' evacuation.

By Mr. Pinard:

Q. Did they have their own cooperative?—A. There was the cooperative called the Pacific Cooperative Union in which the membership was largely Japanese, but I do not know whether you would call it their own cooperative.

Q. Was it for their own people?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, I am afraid I shall have to ask you to respect the ruling with regard to interrupting the witness, because if I grant permission to one member to question the witness I shall have to do so to other members. It was agreed, may I say for the benefit of those who came in late, that Mr. Shears would complete his statement and then be open to questioning.

The WITNESS: Another problem, of course, was the matter of chattels and of personal property, household furniture of all those 22,000 people. In quite a number of instances the Japanese did show some initiative. Living in certain communities they gathered their effects together and stored them in one of their [illegible] for the most part all of their goods and chattels had to be handled by the custodian and moved to storage for

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018.16.1.45-1.4a
www.nikkeimuseum.org

speaking of one building in particular, a Japanese-owned building at 992 Powell street with four floors and a basement, something over, I think, 12,000 square feet of space, with each floor being higher than this room—that building was simply crowded with chattels and furniture and general effects of the Japanese. The position in which the custodian found himself in regard to the matter of chattels was this; he would go into a home from which the Japanese had been evacuated, in some cases we have found even the last meal on the table and not a thing done to the goods which were left; in other cases things had been packed very well. In quite a number of cases a certain amount of packing had been done by throwing certain small items into boxes without lids—sometimes in cardboard cartons. Now, I think you can imagine the condition. Even in our own homes, after having lived in them for a few years and moved out, we have quite a lot of stuff to either destroy or move. The Japanese did not destroy anything. We had the whole of the household effects of the 22,000 Japanese throughout all that protected area to handle in some way. I believe, gentlemen, that only by seeing that particular situation could you fully appreciate what a problem it was. Dr. Coleman, during one of his visits to Vancouver, was able to see some part of the type of chattels which we were handling. There were two advisory committees to which I will refer later. Mr. Justice Sydney Smith, Judge Whiteside, and other members of these committees on several occasions visited the storage places and were simply appalled at the detail of the problem which had to be faced. Even in regard to the matter of identification; because of the manner in which goods were often packed, we were not aware as to whose goods they were. For instance, Mrs. Takahashi would run across to her neighbour Mrs. Kobayhashi and borrow some boxes which might have Mrs. Kobayhashi's name on them, but she would put her own chattels in them and it would appear as though you were dealing with Mrs. Kobayhashi's chattels when you were really dealing with Mrs. Takahashi's chattels. I am simply giving some of the details of the problem which faced us. Now, gentlemen, that was all as a result of the policy of evacuation.

I would now like to come to what resulted from the policy of liquidation, and that, of course, is another phase. We are all aware that many complaints have been made—these complaints have appeared in the press; statements have been made on the floor of the House—that the custodian appears to have given away and sold for a song much of the property which was placed in his hands for protective custody. I should like on this occasion to make very clear the method by which the custodian has liquidated the real and personal property of Japanese who were evacuated from the protected area, and first of all I should like to deal with the real properties which were sold to individuals. No sale, not one sale, has been made by private negotiation; all properties have been advertised and tenders have been called for. The type of advertising is not the hole-in-the-corner method; you might look at these advertisements afterwards. This was the type of advertising which appeared in the newspapers (indicating clippings): "Real property for sale by tender, Department of Secretary of State. . . ." and so forth. These advertisements appeared in twenty-three newspapers, several insertions in each paper, never less than one month given for the general public to submit their tenders. This is the first advertisement and it is dated in British Columbia on the 19th day of June, 1943, and says that tenders will be received by the undersigned up to noon, daylight saving time, the 19th day of July, 1943, on those properties designated in the catalogue as group A. The catalogue was something which the custodian prepared, and I have a copy here which you might also look at. This catalogue gives the civic address, the legal description, and a brief classification of the type of property, such as a dwelling, rooming house, vacant

land, nursery and so forth, and against each property there is the name of a real estate agent residing in the district in which the property is situated

protection, as a matter of fact, over 30 storage locations had to be secured in order to take care of the personal effects of the Jps. In Vancouver —

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-4b
www.nikkeimuseum.org

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, do you wish this catalogue printed as appendix to the minutes? It contains fifteen pages.

Mr. PINARD: What does the catalogue contain?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Largely a list of the names of properties to be sold.

The WITNESS: I have several copies here and we have some in Vancouver.

Mr. STEWART: It should be sufficient for our purpose to have copies of the catalogue and thus save money in printing.

Mr. GLADSTONE: Were the newspaper advertisements large advertisements? Would you give us an estimate of the size in inches for the record?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: They are twelve by three.

The WITNESS: This is more than three, sir.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Twelve by three columns in the newspaper.

The WITNESS: So the general public was well aware by the advertisements and by the fact that catalogues were available, that information could be obtained in regard to rental values, fire insurance, and everything concerned with any particular piece of property in which they might be interested. Then, in addition to that Mr. Chairman, every property was independently appraised. That is a valuation was made by appraisers who in the first instance were suggested to the custodian by the real estate boards of Vancouver and by the real estate boards of Victoria. Those names were submitted to our advisory committee and there again, if you will permit me, I will defer specific reference to that committee until later, and those names were approved by that committee. I had one meeting with this group of appraisers in Vancouver and another meeting with those in Victoria. The whole policy of the custodian was outlined to them. It was indicated that they were to make a fair, unbiased appraisal and that their appraisals were to be considered as confidential. The appraisals were sent in to myself as director of the custodian's office and were not even known to the members of the office until after the first tenders were opened. These valuators had no axe to grind. As a matter of fact, as those properties were to be offered for sale and an ordinary real estate agent might be able to participate in the sale, if anything, it would have been to his advantage to obtain as high a price as possible in order that the commission might be more favourable. There were approximately 900 of these properties sold to individuals on the valuation basis which I have just explained.

And now I would like to mention here what we do know in Vancouver, and I believe it is so in Ottawa, that there has been quite a change in the value of real estate. The situation in Vancouver in 1943 and 1944 was, however, not very much above normal and as an indication of this, I think it is fair to say, that as a result of this extensive type of advertising, the time which the public was given to make an offer on these properties, the facilities for inspection and so on, we only received, and I say only, we only received bids on 60 per cent of the properties when they were first advertised. That is to say they were not so attractive as to create 100 per cent demand. Not all of those 60 per cent were acceptable tenders. As a matter of fact, and I am not quite sure of this figure, but it was about 45 per cent of the tenders that were accepted. The others were refused. Those people who had made tenders which were not acceptable were informed that their offer had been rejected. They were not at that time told what price would be acceptable. They were advised that if they wished to revise their offer such revised offer would be given consideration. The type of property, of course, varied, but I have here, gentlemen, just a few photographs of properties in the Vancouver area and some others on the islands [illegible] I would like you to look at these photographs

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-19-45-159
www.nikkeimuseum.org

that is after this particular group of properties had been advertised, another group of properties was also advertised and another catalogue was printed and subsequently a further catalogue was issued of the unsold properties, where for the first time, it was indicated what the minimum acceptable price would be. That minimum acceptable price was the valuation. That only occurred several months after all tenders had been considered. The 900 properties have all been sold and the approximate returns were $1,750,000. There was another group of farm lands situated in the Fraser Valley. These were small fruit farms to which I previously referred and which were not offered to the general public but by government policy they were purchased and held for returned soldiers. The sale was made on the basis of a valuation which was made under an order in council whereby the Soldier Settlement Board of Canada valued all these properties. Negotiations took place between the director of the Veterans' Land Act and the custodian's department and there were exactly 741 properties included in the final deal. A certain number of properties included in the offer had to be withdrawn as some of them did not belong to the Japanese or the Japanese had previously sold them. The 741 properties were sold on the basis of the Soldier Settlement Board valuation, or at least within two per cent of that valuation, for the sum of $836,000.

Mr. FLEMING: Are those the ones in the Fraser Valley?

The WITNESS: Yes, with the exception of about 20 they were in the Fraser Valley. There remained unsold about 50 other properties. 25 of these are registered in the names of associations, a number of church buildings and so forth, and they have not been offered for sale. In regard to the 25 other properties which have not yet been sold, ten of them are in a place called Port Essington, across from Prince Rupert. I have not been to that particular location, but I have been to Prince Rupert. I understand that Port Essington is kind of a ghost town and there have been no offers for these properties.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: That is not the Fraser Valley you are speaking of now?

The WITNESS: No, no, I should say not, sir.

Then I think I would like to say something about the liquidation of the chattels and personal effects of these Japanese. There again the method adopted was surely sound. Advertisements were placed in newspapers in the areas in which the goods were located, sometimes calling for tenders if the type of property warranted it, such as certain types of machinery, but generally speaking it was all sold by public auction by licensed auctioneers. In the advertisement a rough description is given of the properties to be sold at such and such a date, electric washing machines, sewing machines, bread slicers, bread wrappers, tables, chairs, dressers, etc. That is to say, there was a pretty good indication given as to what was to be sold at the public auction. At all of those auctions there were representatives from my office and quite a number of times I attended the auctions. It can be said that they were always crowded and competition was quite keen. I think perhaps you will agree with me here, Mr. Chairman, in regard to auctions when I say there is a certain type of property which does often fetch as much or more than it is worth. Those are items of medium value. Articles which are valued at around $4 or $5 if you went down to buy them at a store, somehow or other in the heat of the auction, even though the article has been in use for a number of years find people who are prepared to pay four or five or even six dollars for the article. There is however, a type of property which sometimes does not, because of the demand not being there, fetch its highest value. Because of the type of property which the custodian had to sell, I think without a doubt it could be said the goods which were sold at public

auction fetched good, fair, market prices. It is a fact of course that not all of the goods & chattels received from the Jps in the protected area have been sold by the custodian & that is on account of theft & vandalism which

and up upon an inventorial afterwards I would like you to look at these photographs and they will give you some indication of the type of property which the Jps owned throughout the protected area. I would like to mention this so that the story will be complete after these properties had been advertised.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-5b
www.nikkeimuseum.org

undoubtedly has taken place. Now there has been criticism in regard to that. The statement has been made that it looks as if the custodian did a poor job. I am suggesting that if anyone had 7,000 units of chattels to protect which were distributed throughout the whole of the protected area that to give adequate protection, the custodian would have needed 7,000 watchmen. The fact was that in many cases before it was possible for any representative of the custodian even to see, let alone to take actual possession of the property, other people had been there before him. Reference has been made in the House to the property of the Japanese Consul. That was situated in one of the best residential districts of Vancouver. Because it was consular property it did not come into the hands of the custodian but it was under the protection of the protecting power. The first power was Spain and afterwards it was Switzerland. They took charge of that property and the officials boarded it up, and then they boarded it up again and they boarded it up again after that. After the cessation of hostilities the custodian was charged with the responsibility of taking over that property. Mr. Wright and myself went with the Spanish authorities to take over. As I have already said, this property was located in one of the best districts in Vancouver and it was situated almost in its own spacious grounds. Leaded glass windows and doors had been completely taken out. Every light fixture had been taken out and even the grates were taken away and that was the condition in which that particular house was left. Now that illustration has been used to show the public the way in which protection has been given. The force of that illustration is in just the opposite direction. If that was the problem in connection with a house right in Vancouver in one of the best districts, what was the problem of protecting as I have already said, the 7,000 units which were spread here, there, and everywhere? It is a fact that theft and vandalism did take place before the custodian was able to get physical possession and it is also a fact that theft and vandalism did take place even after he was in possession in spite of having night watchmen and night patrols and so on. These places were broken into. It was not only the actual quantity of goods that was removed but it was the fact that you would go into the storage room and you would find box after box had been dumped right onto the floor making it difficult to identify the ownership of many of those small articles, pots and pans and so forth, of which there were numbers galore. I do not want you to think all assets of that nature have been dissipated. As from chattels, and fish netting, something over $650,000 has been realized by the sale of that type of asset.

Mr. FLEMING: $650,000?

The WITNESS: $650,000. I am giving you round figures on it but the figures are approximately correct.

I have just mentioned fish netting which causes me to introduce the matter of fishing vessels because I think it should be understood by this committee that as far as the custodian is concerned fishing vessels were excluded from the original order in council. Fishing vessels were impounded by the navy, and by order in council a Japanese Fishing Vessels Disposal Committee was set up and I believe about 950 of those vessels were disposed of by that committee for the sum of approximately $1,400,000. I believe it is also a fact that the majority of those sales were made by negotiations between the Japanese and the purchaser through the committee before he was evacuated. I would not venture to give the exact percentage but the majority of those sales were negotiated by the Japanese and the Japanese himself signed the transfer of the registry of his vessel to the white purchaser. There were a certain number of vessels left

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-6a
www.nikkeimuseum.org

that I have already indicated and those 180 vessels have also been sold which means to say that all of the fishing fleet of the Japanese has been disposed of either through the fishing vessels committee or through the custodian.

Now, gentlemen, I think perhaps I should hurry on to the end.

May I just give a few general remarks concerning the course of the custodian's administration. Municipal taxes have been paid off, and arrears of taxes have been paid where it was advisable. Mortgages have been settled and unpaid vendors have been paid. That is in cases where property was being sold by white persons to Japanese, the white persons equity has been paid off out of the sale. We advertised in the early stages for the filing of claims from creditors. We received thousands upon thousands of them and the claims were submitted to the Japanese and where there was money available those creditors have been paid. Where it has been the wish of the Japanese, his life insurance policy has been kept in force, and the premium has been paid, if he had available funds. As you well know in our order in council, I think it is P.C. 1665, one section indicates that no charge shall be made by the custodian, "provided however that no commission shall be charged by the custodian in respect of such control or management". The money which has accrued through these sales has all been placed to the credit of the individual evacuees. The money, as far as the custodian has been concerned, was at all times available to them. In cooperation with the Department of Labour these Japanese who were living in what was termed their interior housing settlements, were sent money, so much per month, or whatever arrangement was made between the Japanese and the Department of Labour. As far as the custodian was concerned the money was to the credit of the individual Japanese and was available for payment at any time.

I would like now to deal with the advisory committees to which I have referred, and perhaps I should have dealt with it more fully before. Two advisory committees were set up. One was under chairmanship of Mr. Justice Sidney Smith, with Alderman Charles Jones and a Japanese representative. The other was under chairmanship of Judge Whiteside with Mayor Mott, Mr. D. A. MacKenzie and Mr. Harold Menzies, a citizen of the Fraser Valley area for many years. Every sale to which I have referred has been reviewed by these committees before final acceptance.

Mr. FLEMING: That is in connection with real estate only?

The WITNESS: Well, thank you for asking that. In connection with real estate the offer was submitted and the valuation made on the facts as they were known and the offer was approved or rejected upon the advice of these advisory committees. In regard to the chattels, they were not put up to these committees specifically but these committees did agree upon the principle of selling this type of goods by public auction, by specified auctioneers, whom it was thought it would be desirable to use and the committee ratified sales which were made on that basis. I think I am right in saying that these two committees have not just considered their duty in an offhand rubber-stamp type of way. In regard to the rural committee, their meetings have sometimes extended, as I know, to over three hours at a session and they have asked questions and have asked for evidence to be produced to substantiate statements which I might have been making and it was only upon their knowledge of the situation, their knowledge of the facts as presented to them, that they agreed finally to recommend or approve of the sale.

Mr. STEWART: Was a Japanese on the committee all the time?

The WITNESS: No, there were two Japanese, one was Kumora and the other name escapes me but they were on the committees in the early days and later had to resign. They were evacuated and they sent in their resignations which had

to be accepted and his appointment was made in their place.

over; the order in council speaks of, I think, about 220, but some more were sold by the Jpz Disky. Vessels Disposal Committee and 180 were finally taken over by the Custodian, as you can imagine they were the poorest of the whole fleet. They were the unsold ones they were advertised by the method.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-6b
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Mr. STEWART: When the principle business was being done the Japanese were not represented on the committee?

The WITNESS: That would be largely true. They were both there at the time that the policy of liquidation was being introduced but they really did not deal with any approving of the sales.

Just on that point we have received many complaints from the Japanese. There have been two types of complaints. The chief complaint was, it was not their wish that the property should be sold. That is to say they objected to the principle. Then there have been a certain number of complaints which have been more specific and they said "not only do we object to it being sold but we consider the price is not adequate". However, I would say, from my knowledge of the situation, many of those claims have been greatly exaggerated. In the light of the method which has been adopted as I have outlined here this morning, you can see for yourself the extent to which we went to protect the Japanese against the sale of their property at less than actual value.

Mr. Chairman, I would be very glad if I could answer any questions but I would just like to add another word or two. I know from experience that the task has been by no means an easy one. It was a type of problem that, as far as I know, was almost without precedent. In the early days we had a small staff which grew rapidly. The people employed had no special training for the job which had to be done. Those early days were certainly hectic and there was no such thing as not working regular hours. By the time six o'clock came and the desks were cleared it was necessary to come back in order to get somewhat of a fresh start for the following morning. That situation applied to Sundays as well. I think it is only right to say that with respect to the staff at Vancouver everyone has always acted in consonance with their position as custodian employees and on behalf of the Japanese.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you Mr. Shears for this very full statement. Now, gentlemen, you are at liberty to ask any questions and I have the first signal from Mr. Stewart. I will try to keep you within bounds and not allow one particular member of the committee to monopolize the whole time, subject of course to your ruling. I will try to catch your signals as quickly as possible and I will call on the respective members. The first is Mr. Stewart.

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. The question I was going to ask now is based solely on Mr. Shears' statement. I think I speak for the committee when I say we appreciate what you have said and I think we can appreciate the difficulties which the custodian out there had in connection with the protection of this property. The first thing I would like to ask is whether as you said, registration of property on the part of the Japanese was entirely voluntary. What would you have done to them if they had not registered?—A. It was voluntary. The order in council read "That upon evacuation property left in the protected area became vested". The purpose of the registration form was only that the Japanese might help supply information. In the main they co-operated very well. On the other hand, there were certain numbers who moved out and they did not register and we simply discovered the property afterwards.

Q. They had no alternative but to register?—A. Well it was all to their advantage to register, but they were not forced to register.

Q. You said later on that inspectors were appointed to examine the property. How many inspectors did you have at the peak time, could you tell me offhand or give me their names?—A. The inspectors who, first of all, looked at these properties in Vancouver were themselves chartered accountants. This was [illegible] purpose of investigation. This is going back some while, but I think

areas where a person was appointed, for example, in a place such as Cumberland someone—as a matter of fact, in that case I was over myself and had an interview with a bank manager. I found out that such and such a person would appear to be the right type of person to act in a temporary way on behalf of the custodian. This particular person was approached. He was given a list of the properties of which we knew. He went around and made his report saying that this was a property which was vacant. He suggested it might easily be rented and so forth. Real estate agents were then appointed. You will get the names of a considerable number of them from these catalogues.

Q. In connection with the farms in the Fraser Valley, you said there were some 741 sold. Were the valuations made by the D.V.A.?—A. The valuations were made by the Soldiers' Settlement of Canada.

Q. How did those valuations compare with the assessed value?—A. On the 741 properties, the assessment was $1,250,940 and the appraisal was $847,878. The offer accepted, which I said was within 2 per cent, was $830,256.

Q. Many of these matters I intend to pursue later. I just wanted to get certain facts for the moment. With regard to the chattels the vandalism which took place, can you tell the committee if any suspects were apprehended by the police and whether there were any prosecutions?—A. There were no prosecutions. In some cases there was some suspicion. The police suggested it was usually a group of youths who did it. No one was prosecuted any way.

Q. Who is going to bear the loss caused by this vandalism? Is it the Japanese themselves?—A. I can only refer to the statement which was made by the Honourable Colin Gibson in the House a few days ago. I do understand that the matter is under active consideration by the government, that is, in regard to the payment of any claims in regard to such matters as you have mentioned.

Q. When the chattels were sold by auction, what expenses were charged against the gross amount received?—A. The usual auctioneer's fee in Vancouver, for an individual, is that he will sell your goods for a 15 per cent commission. We made arrangements with the auctioneer, in view of the exceptional circumstances, that he would charge 10 per cent and we would do the advertising. As a matter of fact, our advertising only came to about 3 per cent so, as far as we have gone, it was about 13 per cent instead of 15 per cent. However, because of the very nature of the case, it did cost us almost, I think, 9 per cent of the value to collect up these goods. We could not just hand them over to the auctioneer. We, ourselves, had to do the unpacking and sorting out and that charge has been assessed against the Japanese.

Q. That was an expense, but it was an office expense, and that means 22 per cent would be charged against the gross?—A. Yes, I think about 21 per cent; that would be the average. In some cases it would not be as much as that.

Q. Then, you would credit that amount to the various Japanese's accounts? —A. Yes.

Q. Was any allowance made for interest on credit balances whenever there were credit balances?—A. No, no interest has been allowed.

By Mr. Gladstone:

Q. Could we have a word picture of some of the localities, the coast homes, the area in Vancouver, the Steveston location, and a picture of the Fraser Valley, just briefly?—A. I am just wondering, in that regard, whether this might not be the answer. This, as you can see contains pictures, mostly of the area of which you are speaking. Then, I have here what we called "Little Tokio", the Powell Street area, and another one for one of these sections of Vancouver. I brought this as a sample from Vancouver. We have nine or ten of them. These

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018.16.1.45.1-2a
www.nikkeimuseum.org

deal with Vancouver and the municipal area.

probably there would be 90 or 10 employed in that area. Then, in the other

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-7b
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Q. I had in mind something which might go in the record.?—A. Well, I think it is certainly true to say this, when speaking of the Powell Street and Cordova Street area in Vancouver, that the Japanese property consisted of a group of sub-standard properties. Many of them were in terrible shape. As a matter of fact, when we came to make rental arrangements for that type of property, we could not get a tenant to go in unless we made an arrangement whereby he would, himself, make certain improvements which were absolutely necessary. To that extent, we rebated an amount of the rental.

The city authorities, after the evacuation of the Japanese, came to us. We attended a meeting of their board on one occasion. It was their hope this would be an opportunity to improve the standard of the properties in that area. Taking the custodian's point of view we said, "Well now, you have allowed these properties to exist in this condition until now. Should you be quite so strict just at the moment the custodian steps in?"

From that time on, the city authorities were co-operative and, providing a new tenant approached them and made arrangements that he would do certain things to the lighting fixtures or sanitary facilities, the city authorities allowed the new tenant to take possession of that property. This Japanese property was definitely sub-standard and this was true of the Japanese property in the main. Of course, there are some very nice properties but, in the main, the majority of the properties were not of any particularly fancy type. As in everything else, there would be some good properties. I do not know whether that answers you or not.

Q. What about the upper coast properties?—A. Would it be in order for Mr. Wright to say something about that? He visited some of those properties. Some of those properties were situated on the foreshore. In quite a few cases I have seen them housed on posts, with the water running right underneath them. Many of them were just shacks.

Then, there are some areas in the Fraser Valley facing the Fraser River, where the land is described as a peat bog district. In order to get from the front of the property up to the house, a walk has to be made. Between the property and the river, there would be a road, but between the road and the property a ditch had to be put in.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Just a moment, to keep the record straight in connection with this matter, my friend is entirely wrong in his description of the property. I defy him to name me any area in the Fraser Valley where that is true. I know the area to which you are referring down at Lulu Island, but that is not the Fraser Valley.

The WITNESS: I apologize, that is correct. I had the Lulu Island district in mind when I was making that statement.

By Mr. Cruickshank:

Q. I should like to ask one question. Is it not true, I am speaking of the farms in the Fraser Valley, that a large percentage of them were what is known in farm language as, burnt out farms?—A. The information which came to us was this, that the type of farming which the Japanese did, I am just passing on the information which was given to me, that they were not farmers in the real sense of the word but they were miners. I mean to say that they produced good crops, but they did so definitely at the expense of the land itself. Now, I am not a farmer and cannot say whether that is true, but that is the information

Q. In other words, the land was burnt out?—A. Yes, that expression has

By Mr. Boucher:

Q. Is my understanding correct that you said the properties had sold at approximately 60 per cent or approximately 80 per cent of the assessed value? I think you said about $800,000 was received for the property.—A. The appraised value was—

Q. The sale value was less than the appraisal value?—A. The sale value was 2 per cent less than the appraised value.

Q. The appraised value was how much less than the assessed value?—A. I will have to do a little bit of arithmetic. The chairman says it is 1¾ per cent. It is about two-thirds, about 66 per cent of the assessed valuation, is that what you mean? The sale price to the V.L.A. was two-thirds of the assessed value, but it was within 2 per cent of the appraised value.

By Mr. Winkler:

Q. In regard to the sale of the fishing vessels, were those sold freely and if so were any sold by auction?—A. They were sold freely by the Japanese Fishing Vessels Disposal Committee. When the balance came into the hands of the custodian, the custodian took over this certain number of boats, 170 I think it was, and also what was termed the unfinished business of the Japanese Fishing Vessels Disposal Committee. The unfinished business consisted of collecting money from purchasers who had not yet paid the full sale price. These boats were all valued, advertised and sold on that basis. So far as the boats which the custodian handled, I can assure you that the 170 were not the worth-while boats by any manner of means. They were different types of boats. There were what are called seiners, packers, gill netters and cod fishers, all having a relatively different purpose and a different scale of prices. In the main the custodian has not been responsible for the sale of fishing vessels except the odd ones left over which we cleaned up.

By Mr. Cruickshank:

Q. I should like to ask one question. Do you say anything in your records of the amount of chattels such as washing machines and that type of thing which were not turned in or not taken over by any branch of the government, but which were left with private friends of the Japanese? What I am trying to get at is this, that it is not fair—I am not defending the custodian's branch at all—but it is hardly fair to say that there were a lot of cases in which the Japanese were not paid for their chattels by some branch of the government when they were left with private white friends of the Japanese. I presume your department has knowledge of that. For instance, there were frigidaires, beautiful stoves and even a piano left with private individuals in my own district. So far as I know, they are still in those private homes.

Mr. PROBE: Those all came from these sub-standard houses?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: No, from farms, but it is not fair to say the custodian's branch has not paid a proper amount for the chattels. In other words, the Japanese have no right now to say they were not paid for a frigidaire by the custodian if it was not handed over but was left with private individuals. That is correct, is it not?

The WITNESS: That is correct. We think the amount of that type of chattel now is relatively small, but we cannot be certain. As has been stated, the Japanese, in certain cases, did not divulge to the custodian on this registration form all the information concerning these chattels. We were not aware of it. In one way and another, we did find out about it. In some cases, it may

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-8a
www.nikkeimuseum.org

have been left with white friends just as you have stated. There were certain items of furniture and, from time to time these have been disclosed. Sometimes

beer used, not all, but certain of the valley properties. The land was burnt out

they have been taken over by the custodian and sold, but there are still some of them, I would say a limited amount, which are in the hands of other people and have not been handed over to the custodian.

By Mr. Warren:

Q. I should like to ask this question, before we get too far away from these burnt out lands, would you be able to give us an approximate idea at what price per acre this land was sold?—A. At the moment, I think I would prefer not to attempt to answer that, that is, on an acreage basis. I have not, immediately in front of me, any figures on that.

By Mr. Green:

Q. Was the price for this land set by the custodian or the Veterans' Land Act people?—A. Negotiations were carried on precisely in this way. Under the order in council, the Soldiers' Settlement people were appointed to make a valuation of the Japanese rural properties, the farm properties. They made that valuation, during which time the custodian was withdrawn from the picture. After the valuation had been made, the custodian again became the vested owner of these particular properties. The next step was that the custodian received an offer from the director of the Veterans' Land Act to buy 840, that is not quite the number, but that does not matter, of these properties for the sum of $750,000.

At that time, negotiations took place. A gentleman who came from Ottawa to Vancouver sat in with me in the advisory council on it. There was a representative of the director of the Veterans' Land Act and a representative of the custodian's office. Their offer, as I say, was $750,000 against a valuation of $867,000. I do not want to get you confused. The offer was for more properties than we eventually sold. The figures which I have given you and which are accurate are for what was actually sold. The offer was $750,000 for properties which, according to the Soldiers' Settlement valuation were worth $867,000. This offer of $750,000 was rejected. Negotiations were carried on and eventually the director of Veterans' Land Act offered $850,000 for those properties which were valued at $867,000. On that basis, the deal was consummated. Then, the exact number of properties were adjusted.

As I say, certain properties had to be withdrawn. The encumbrances were more than the offer in some cases and in some cases the properties belonged to deceased persons and had to be administered by an official administrator. Those properties were withdrawn from the sale which was made to the director of the Veterans' Land Act.

Q. Was the position that you were only allowed to sell these farms to the Veterans' Land Act people? The Veterans' Land Act people made the valuation and then offered $100,000 less than the valuation and finally came up slightly below their own valuation; is that the picture? Were you or were you not free agents? Were you able to sell to anyone outside or did you have to sell to the Veterans' Land Act department, really on their own terms?—A. Well, of course, I do not know. It is not for me to say. It was the Soldiers' Settlement people who made the valuation and the director of the Veterans' Land Act who made the offer. I am just mentioning that. Then it was a question of negotiation. It was, definitely, a suggestion of the government department that it would be desirable for these properties to be held for returned men. The negotiations were carried out, as I have said, on the basis of a valuation which was considered by the advisory committee as being a fair offer; that is to say, the obtaining of within 2 per cent of the valuation for a group of farms on the basis of a cash payment within a limited time. It was considered that would be quite a good deal.

By Mr. Jaenicke:

Q. I have a question or two which I should like to ask. I do not know whether or not I understand this situation correctly. You have mentioned the assessment of those properties as being $1,250,000, approximately, is that right?—A. Yes.

Q. Those are the properties which were finally sold for $850,000?—A. They were sold for $836,000.

Q. They are only rural properties?—A. They were all small farms.

Q. What about the urban properties?—A. They were those 900 properties about which I have spoken in the first instance which were advertised and placed in catalogues or specially advertised from time to time. You must have in your mind two groups of real estate sales, the 900 properties which were sold to individuals by this method which I have indicated and the 700 odd which were sold to the Veterans' Land people.

Q. How does the sale price of those properties compare to the assessed value?—A. You mean the urban properties?

Q. Yes.—A. The figures in the greater Vancouver area—I have a record here of 466 sales. The assessed value was $1,183,313; the appraisal was $915,600 and they were sold for $1,004,785.

Q. Are the assessments on improvements in Vancouver to the full value or only 60 per cent?—A. The question of relating sale price to assessment, while I presume it has some bearing, is a difficult thing because, I think I am right in saying in different areas there are different assessors, of course, and different methods of assessment.

Q. How are the improvements assessed in Vancouver, at the full value? —A. On the improvements, it is 50 per cent. We have been told by the officials in Vancouver that over a period of quite a few years, I believe almost ten years, no drastic change has been made in assessment values. At times, the court of revision was convened because of complaints put in, but by and large, they had been side tracked. There has been practically no change in assessment values for a long time.

Q. What about the rural areas, are they assessed each year and is there any change made each year?—A. I am sorry, I am not in a position to answer that question.

Q. Did you make any enquiries when you received the valuation from the Soldiers' Settlement people and found them to be so much lower than the assessed value? Did you make any enquiry as to how that came about?—A. The deal was consummated more on the basis of the valuation, not on the assessed value.

Q. You made no enquiries as to why there should be a difference between the assessment and appraised values by the Soldiers' Settlement people?—A. I do not recall that that point was brought up. I should like you to understand I am not shelving any responsibility but I was sitting in at that time with an official from Ottawa.

Q. I do not know how it is in British Columbia, but in our province the assessed values are usually lower than the actual valuation.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Are you speaking of the rural property?

Mr. JAENICKE: I am speaking of the rural property.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: I wish all the members would keep in mind the fact that there are three separate headings under which these sales go, namely, those in the greater Vancouver area, those in the urban area at large and the rural properties which were handled, as I understand it, 741 sales through the Veterans' Affairs Department and the Soldiers' Settlement Act.

By Mr. Boucher:

Q. Can you give me any information as to the relationship of assessed value in the rural area to the relationship of sales in the year 1943, generally in the

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-9
www.nikkeimuseum.org

municipalities? In other words, most municipalities can give you a calculation as to what portion of the current sale value the assessed value is. Do you have any information on that, or was any investigation made in that regard?—A. I think we have to have this in mind; we are thinking back to the year 1942 or 1943 and I think it would be right to say that, in the rural areas, the prices at which properties were changing hands were considerably less than the assessed value. I mention that with a certain amount of diffidence, but I am not making a wild statement. I have been given to understand that, in that area, apart altogether from the custodian's property, when properties were sold, the value obtained did not measure up to the assessed valuation.

By Mr. Cruickshank:

Q. Is it not true that in every rural municipality in British Columbia, the assessed value has practically no relationship to the sale price?—A. That is perfectly true. As an indication of that, just take a jump for one minute to the city areas. The city was selling vacant lands, I am not speaking of improved lands but there were some of them improved, but the city was selling these lands at 60 to 70 per cent of the assessed value.

By Mr. Probe:

Q. But they were conditional sales, conditional upon building, were they not? —A. That may be so, but in any event the purchaser had something which was not improved and it was sold at a proportion of its assessed value. In the rural areas, I think I am right in saying that the municipalities were prepared to sell land at from 50 to 60 per cent of the assessed valuation. If you are going to get into the question of the relationship of sale price to assessment, you would have to consider individually every municipality because it is not the same all the way through.

By Mr. Boucher:

Q. Is it not a fact that in almost every registry office they can give you that data as to the relationship of the sale value of land sold each year to the assessed value of the same land?

By Mr. Pinard:

Q. I should like to get some information in so far as the disposal of business concerns owned by the Japanese is concerned. They must have had business concerns. What happened to them? Were they sold, and if so, what was the policy followed in that respect?—A. In regard to businesses, as I indicated at the start, I believe quite a few hundred were sold by the Japanese themselves. If they were not sold, the custodian was in this position; he had a dry cleaning establishment, we will say, situated in rented premises. While the Japanese was there, he was carrying on and he had a business. The Japanese was evacuated and the custodian comes into the picture, having dry cleaning equipment in a rented building. We really sold the dry cleaning equipment, that is to say, we were not in a position, generally speaking to sell the goodwill or the concern as a business. That type of article was advertised and sold Tenders were called for on the actual equipment and, of course, the purchaser of that equipment had to move it unless he made some arrangement with the owner of the building.

Q. What happened to the accounts when there were credits to be collected from the customers?—A. This form provides for a declaration of monies owing to the Japanese. Any debts owing to the Japanese were collected, in so far as possible. [illegible] and numerous collections on

behalf of the Japanese were made. I mean to say the custodian has collected, on behalf of the Japanese, any debts which were made known to him, where it has been possible to collect.

Q. Were the services of lawyers required in that respect in some cases? —A. I do not recollect any. There have been cases where the debtor refused to acknowledge the debt, in which case we got in touch with the Japanese and told him that this man disputed the debt.

Mr. Stewart: In connection with the Fraser Valley farms which were sold, they were sold on a basis of about $1,100 each, approximately. We have been told they were burnt out and were mined. If that is the case, the income resulting from the operation of those farms would have been low. How was it that the tenants or owners of those farms were able to acquire so much money that they could purchase frigidaires, pianos and washing machines in such vast quantities they could distribute them among their friends?

Mr. Cruickshank: I would be glad to answer that, if I were permitted.

By Mr. Stuart:

Q. The thing I have in mind is that I remember, after the last war, property was worth much more than it was 15 years previous. I wonder if we could be told what the price of that property in question would be today compared with the price about ten years ago; has the value increased? In my province, property which would be worth $5,000 today would have been worth about $2,500 a few years ago.—A. I am very sorry, but I did not catch the import of that statement. Would you mind repeating it?

Q. In short, all I want to ask is this, is the property today, in those areas of which you spoke, worth far more money than it was prior to the war? The value today might be much greater—A. The value today is undoubtedly greater than it was in 1943. I do not think there is any doubt of that. Speaking generally, Vancouver real estate or property in that area has a considerably enhanced value.

The Vice-Chairman: Gentlemen, it is now after one o'clock. Mr. Shears, as you know, is from Vancouver. I do not know whether he is anxious, but I think the government is anxious that he return to his duties as soon as possible. He is here at your request and he will stay just as long as you need him, but I am naturally anxious to expedite the business, so we might sit to-morrow instead of waiting until next week. We will meet to-morrow at 11.30 in the hope of winding up his evidence.

The committee adjourned at 1.00 p.m. to meet again on Friday, May 9, 1947, at 11.30 a.m.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-10
www.nikkeimuseum.org

APPENDIX "A"

FORM "JP" FILE NO.....

OFFICE OF THE CUSTODIAN

JAPANESE SECTION

To be completed by persons of the Japanese race having property in any protected area. The proper administration of this property requires such persons to give full particulars as requested in this form.

Personal Information

Name .....

Home Address .....

Registration Number .....Sex.....Age.....

Occupation .....

.....

(If any business or businesses carried on, state where, under what name and whether carried on by yourself or in partnership with anyone; if partnership, give partner's name.)

Employer .....

Married? .....

Name of Wife or Husband .....

Address of Wife or Husband .....

Names of Any Living Children .....

.....

.....

Address of Children .....

Age of Children .....

Statement of All Real Property (Each parcel must be mentioned and particulars given)

1. Location and Description .....
.....
.....
.....
2. Buildings and Other Improvements .....
.....
.....
.....
3. Insurance (Give particulars; state where policies are).....
.....
4. Taxes (Amount and where payable).....
5. Encumbrances (Including any unregistered claims or deposit of title deed)
.....
.....
.....

5. Sub-Tenants, If Any (Give name, address, rent and to what date paid)...
6. Occupancy and Leases (If vacant so state).....
.....
.....
7. State Whereabouts of Title Documents.....
8. State if any Other Person Has any Interest.....
9. If Farm Land State Crops Sown.....

Statement of Real Property Occupied

1. Location and Description .....
.....
2. Landlord's Name and Address .....
.....
3. Particulars of Lease and Rent and Date to Which Paid.....
.....
4. State Whereabouts of Lease .....
.....
.....
.....
6. If Farm Land, Particulars of Crops Sown.....
.....
.....

Statement of Personal Property Owned:

1. Give Brief Description and State Location of Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment and Machinery, Stock in Trade and Personal Effects:
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
2. Horses, Livestock and Other Animals, Poultry and Pets.....
.....
.....
.....
3. Give the Name and Address of Any Person Having Any Interest in, or Claim on Any Such Property.....
.....
.....

Form "JP" File No.....

4. Insurance Carried on Above Property.....
.....
5. Mortgages, Liens and Other Claims on Property in Possession of Others
.....
.....
6. Moneys Owing to You (State if any of these debts assigned and if so, to whom).....
.....
.....

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-11
www.nikkeimuseum.org

7. Bonds, Debentures, Shares, Stocks or Other Securities (State whereabouts)
.....
.....
8. Bank Accounts.....
9. Life Insurance.....
.....
10. Interest in Any Estates or Trusts.....
.....
11. Safety Deposit Box.....

Liabilities:

1. Personal Debts.....
.....
.....
2. Trade Debts.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

I, the undersigned, hereby voluntarily turn over to the Custodian all my property in the proteeted area as set out above, exeepting fishing vessels, deposits of money, shares of stock, debentures, bonds or other securities, if any.

I certify that the above information is true and complete and fully discloses all my property of every description in any proteeted area in British Columbia and sets forth all my liabilities direct and indirect.

Dated this.....day of.....1943.

(Signature).....

.....
Witness

For Departmental Use.....

.....

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-12
www.nikkeimuseum.org

SESSION 1947

HOUSE OF COMMONS

MAY 22 '47.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY

STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 5

FRIDAY, MAY 9, 1947

WITNESSES:

Dr. E. H. Coleman, C.M.G., K.C., Deputy Custodian of Enemy Property; Mr. F. G. Shears, Director Vancouver Office, and Mr. K. W. Wright, Counsel.

OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., B.A., L.Ph.,
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
1947

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

HOUSE OF COMMONS, Room 497,

FRIDAY, May 9, 1947.

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts met at 11.30 o'clock, a.m. The Vice-Chairman, Mr. Gordon B. Isnor, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Burton, Case, Cleaver, Coté (*Verdun*), Cloutier, Cruickshank, Fleming, Fraser, Gladstone, Golding, Green, Isnor, Jaenicke, Marshall, Probe, Raymond (*Wright*), Rinfret, Smith (*Calgary West*), Stuart (*Charlotte*), Thatcher, Warren, Winkler.

In attendance: Dr. E. H. Coleman, C.M.G., K.C., Deputy Custodian of Enemy Property; Mr. F. G. Shears, Director Vancouver Office; Mr. K. W. Wright, Counsel.

The Committee resumed examination of Mr. Shears respecting the administration of the Vancouver Office of the Custodian.

Mr. Jaenicke tabled certain documents relating to inventory of chattels left on property of, and owned by, one named Naochi Karatsu. The witness, Mr. Shears, was questioned thereon and, after some discussion, he agreed to supply the Committee, at the earliest possible moment, with a full report on the said matter.

The witness also agreed to supply the Committee with certain information relating to the sale of certain evacuees' lands requested by Mr. Cruickshank and Mr. Fleming.

At 1.05 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned to meet again at 11 o'clock a.m., Monday, May 12, 1947.

ANTOINE CHASSÉ,
Acting Clerk of the Committee.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-13
www.nikkeimuseum.org

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

May 9, 1947.

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts met this day at 11.30 a.m. The Vice-Chairman, Mr. Gordon B. Isnor, presided.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, shall we come to order. We have the necessary number to form a quorum and unless there is other business to be brought before the meeting we will continue to hear Mr. Shears.

Frank G. Shears, Director of the Office of the Custodian, Vancouver, recalled:

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, I think I would like to make one brief statement in clarification of something which was mentioned yesterday. In regard to the sale of the properties in the Fraser Valley area a question was asked as to what was the average price. I think the figure given was about $1,130. I do not think that is quite a fair picture of that deal because I have an individual list here and there was a property that sold for $10,768, another for $7,200, another for $5,500, and three others at $4,500, $3,000 and $2,000. There were also a number of properties that brought very small amounts such as $125, $200, $400, so that in saying the average was $1,130, it really does not give a picture. I just wish to indicate that in that group of properties there were varying types and the prices varied considerably. I would like to mention that for the purpose of the record.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: All right, Mr. Cote?

By Mr. Cote:

Q. Yesterday, Mr. Shears referred to some advisory committees that had been set up for the purpose of assisting the custodian's office in Vancouver in carrying out the duties and policies of the custodian. How many committees did you say, Mr. Shears, were set up for this purpose?—A. There were two advisory committees. One committee concerned itself with what we call the greater Vancouver properties and the other concerned itself with the properties outside that area. The greater Vancouver area committee was presided over by Mr. Justice Sidney Smith, and the other one was presided over by Judge Whiteside.

Q. Were they both in the city of Vancouver?—A. No, the greater Vancouver advisory committee sat in Vancouver, usually in Mr. Justice Sidney Smith's office. The other committee, except for a few initial meetings in Vancouver, always sat at New Westminster and usually sat in the Judge's office. Mayor Mott of New Westminster was also one of the advisory committee members.

Q. How many members were in each of these committees?—A. I will just give you the exact set-up. Two independent committees were established. One was known as the advisory committee for the greater Vancouver properties and the following members were appointed to the committee on March 8, 1943: Honourable Mr. Justice Sidney Smith, the chairman, of the Appellate Court of British Columbia; Alderman Charles Jones, and Mr. Kishizo Kimura. Mr. Kimura resigned on July 20, 1943. The other committee was known as the

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-14
www.nikkeimuseum.org

advisory committee on rural properties. The following members were appointed on March 15, 1943: His Honour Judge David Whiteside of New Westminster was the chairman. The others were Messrs D. E. MacKenzie and J. J. McLellan and Mr. Hal Menzies.

Mr. MacKenzie is now deceased and Judge Whiteside quite recently died. Mayor W. Mott of New Westminster was appointed to take the place of Mr. McLellan who attended only one or two meetings and then resigned. Mr. Hal Menzies was a real estate gentleman who had lived in that vicinity for many years. The Japanese, Mr. Yasutaro Yamaga, who was the representative on this committee resigned on May 26, 1943.

Q. By whom were the members of these two committees appointed?—A. I beg pardon?

Q. By whom were the members of those two committees appointed?—A. The committees were appointed directly by the Secretary of State Department.

Q. You have mentioned, Mr. Shears, that the two Japanese representatives had resigned of their own accord at the beginning of the activities of the two committees. Would you have the date of their resignations in each case?—A. Mr. Kimura resigned on July 20, 1943 and Mr. Yamaga resigned on May 26, 1943.

CNB THE DAY AFTER LIQUIDATION POLICY IMPLEMENTED

Mr. Bourque: Did they give any reason for resigning or what were the reasons?

The Witness: I recollect that a letter from one of them said that he felt his services or the services which he could render had been completed and there would be no particular reason for his remaining on the board. That letter was from Mr. Yamaga and I think Mr. Kimura just merely sent in his resignation stating that he preferred not to be on the committee and of course both of those Japanese persons had been evacuated and were living quite a distance from Vancouver and New Westminster.

Mr. Cote: Had they been engaged individually in the business of the committee?

The Witness: For the first few meetings they did and they agreed in principle that the policy the custodian was following on management and also on liquidation was satisfactory. They were not in attendance at any meeting when specific offers were being dealt with.

Mr. Jaenicke: Could they have been there?

The Witness: They had resigned.

Mr. Jaenicke: Was there some correspondence leading up to their resignations?

The Witness: I only recollect the letters in which they resigned.

By Mr. Cote:

Q. Would you have in writing any expression of satisfaction on their part with the policy followed by the custodian?—A. As I have already mentioned, I feel sure that the letter that came in from Mr. Yamaga indicated satisfaction with the principle. I could not go further than that without producing the letter.

Q. Was there any attempt made, Mr. Shears, to have these two Japanese representatives replaced on the two boards?—A. No, when their resignations were received both those committees considered the matter and made no recommendation that they should be replaced and the remaining members of the board carried on.

Q. Have you, or has anyone else, received any request from the evacuees or the Japanese to have these two members replaced following their resignations?—A. Definitely no.

Q. Now did you start liquidating the assets of the evacuees before the evacuation was completed?—A. No, not at all. The only properties that were sold previous to the evacuation were the properties which were sold by the Japanese themselves. The policy of liquidation, as a matter of fact, did not come into effect until the 19th of July, 1943. That was the date when the tenders first closed for the properties which were advertised. That is of course apart from the sale which was made to the director of the Veterans' Land Act.

Q. I heard you say yesterday, Mr. Shears, that one of the complaints that you received from the evacuees was that they were absent when their property was sold. Did you receive a great number of protests of that kind?—A. Yes, we did. As I intimated yesterday there were two types of complaints. A considerable number of the complaints simply said, "We do not wish to have our property sold," or "We do not wish that it shall be liquidated." Then there were a number of Japanese who wrote to the office and said, "Not only do we not wish our property to be sold, but having been sold we do not think that the amounts realized have been adequate." In some cases they mention in their letters that they thought the price should have been such and such. Just broadly speaking, there were those two types of letters and they have all been acknowledged by the department stating that their letters remain on the record and we indicated that we were carrying out a policy which had been outlined by the government.

Q. Were they individually notified when tenders were called, for instance, for the sale of real properties and when their chattels were to be sold or when any of their other assets were to be sold?—A. No, not at all. *

Q. Could they have had any way of following the procedure of the custodian in the disposition of their own personal assets?—A. No, I would not say they could. They were not living in the area and of course they were all aware of the policy of evacuation. The Japanese had the option of having anything that they wished shipped to them. That was not real property of course but it applied as far as household chattels and so on were concerned. Those things were available on request. They were also aware that the policy of liquidation of chattels was coming into effect. The policy was widely known in the camps in which they were living, and they knew their goods were to be sold under the government's policy.

Q. What did you mean Mr. Shears when you stated they could have some of their assets shipped to them?—A. If, by any chance, they wanted all their furniture or everything they owned they could have had it shipped but we did not have any requests for shipment. I think one of the reasons for that would be that a lot of it would never have justified the cost of shipment. Up until those household effects were sold by auction the custodian was willing and ready at any time to ship the goods to the Japanese. I know that in some cases we have shipped certain quantities.

Mr. Cruickshank: At whose expense?

The Witness: At the expense of the Japanese.

By Mr. Cote:

Q. Where were the goods shipped?—A. To the place where they were residing. In regard to the Japanese that were living in what they called the interior housing settlements, they were provided with all that was considered necessary to provide a home and subsistence. If they wanted anything further we shipped it in co-operation with the Department of Labour. If they requested shipment they were advised that they would have to take care of the charges but that the goods were available for shipment at any time.

Q. Did you have a substantial number of requests for shipment?—A. No, just a limited number.

* contradicts report of the Minister of Mines & Resources

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-15
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Q. Now after any assets had been disposed of were the Japanese individually notified as to the proceeds of those sales?—A. They have all been notified. I would not care to say that they were notified immediately. The accounting of all those items was considerable but they were all definitely notified, and in fact long since, every Japanese has had a statement of his account. If he has not had a statement it is an omission. The statements were made in many cases continually, starting from his first balance and continuing on up to his present balance. I would say that if any Japanese requested information he was given immediate consideration but if he did not request it he would only get it in the normal course and there would be some little delay. However, there was no purposeful delay in not revealing to him what his credit was if his goods had been sold.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Mr. Cote, I do not know how much more you have to take up but I am keeping in mind the ruling which I made yesterday.

Mr. COTE: I am very sorry, but I am about through.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: I do not want to interrupt but I am just trying to live up to what I said.

By Mr. Cote:

Q. I will be very brief. I was going to ask, Mr. Shears, about what he said in regard to the complete record of the Japanese. I am wondering how you would learn of the new places in which they were living?—A. I did not get the import of that.

Q. I say that on the 19th of July when you first closed off the tenders, you could not at the time have communicated with each and all of the evacuees because you were not at that time aware of their addresses.—A. We did not communicate with any of them.

Q. But later on you did?—A. We were aware of the addresses of these Japanese at all times by inquiries which we were able to make through the Department of Labour and our files were kept definitely up to date with respect to the location of these Japanese. Our department had no concern with that matter but we had all the information that we wanted at any time with respect to where any Japanese was living.

Q. I understand you opened individual accounts for each of these evacuees from the moment that you had something on deposit?—A. Yes, we opened individual accounts for every Japanese who had any money to his credit.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: You are next Mr. Jaenicke.

By Mr. Jaenicke:

Q. I was just going to follow up some of the matters brought out by Mr. Cote. I have here an example of some of the goods and chattels handled. I am predicating my remarks by saying we heard Mr. Shears yesterday on the difficulty that his office had in keeping track of the goods and chattels and that there was a lot of theft and vandalism and things of that nature. However, I think the committee should have some information on this particular case and I should like, after I am through, to have Mr. Shears comment on it. I have here a copy of an inventory of a Japanese by the name of Maochi Karatsu, registration number 12051, and file number 8666. This inventory is an inventory of all his goods and chattels which was compiled by this Japanese in the presence of a Mr. W. E. Anderson of your office. I believe he is in the farm department of your office.—A. What date is that, may I ask?

Q. October 28, 1942. My information is this Japanese was still at that time at his home and that is where this inventory was made. All the goods and chattels were valued in the presence of and apparently with the consent of Mr. Anderson and I think the valuation is reasonable. Chairs are valued at $1 apiece,

some at 50 cents apiece, and they are very small valuations. A box contained a quantity of fishing tackle valued at $160 including one good condition high-tension magnet, the cost of which was $80. There was a one-quart water kent coil which cost $15; one dozen bearings $15; ten sprockets, $12; twelve paint brushes, $30. Another large item is a tool-box containing fishing gear for commercial purposes. Two hundred fathoms of stainless trolling wire, (cost $30); one hundred new fish-hooks for pilchard bait, (cost $7.50); two hundred spoon hooks, (cost $70). The total valuation of the articles contained in that box was $107.50. The other valuations on the inventory are just small, ranging anywhere from 15 cents to about $5.00. The total valuation on this inventory is $723.45. Apparently on March 15 this Japanese, Mr. Karatsu, wrote to the office requesting that certain articles be sent to him. I may say certain articles were sent to him according to the inventory, including three steel bedsprings which were sent, but which, by the way, were valued at $2. Also a chesterfield chair which had no valuation on this inventory was sent. Apparently he requested some further articles to be sent to him and on March 15, 1947 he received a letter from the office of Mr. Shears, signed by Mr. W. E. Anderson reading in part as follows:

> In reply to your letter of March 15 in which you ask that certain chattels be sent to you, we have to advise that we are unable to ship these articles as some have been sold at auction and others are missing. The books were badly mildewed and damaged and were discarded as being of no value. We are enclosing an itemized statement of the articles sold at auction and the balance not shown on this sheet were either stolen, or damaged and declared of no value.
>
> Referring to your enquiry as to expenses against your boats; these expenses are proportionate charges covering supervision, insurance and survey expenses actually paid out. No office expenses or commission on the sales have been charged.
>
> Your account has now been credited with the sum of $43.50 representing $21.75 on each boat covering a transportation claim from Steveston to Tofino. These amounts have been credited as it is understood that you delivered one boat and paid the expenses on the other one on the trip down and return to Tofino. We would appreciate your confirmation that this is correct.
>
> A statement of your account is enclosed and these funds are available to you on request.
>
> Yours truly,

I may say I mention nothing about the boats but I simply refer to the goods and chattels of which I gave you a description and an explanation of the inventory. Now here is the statement of the goods and chattels which were sold by auction at Mission, B.C., on March 7, 1945. The total is given as $10.40. On an inventory that was originally $723. There was an expense of $4.04 against it leaving a balance of $6.36 for this inventory. Now as I say, Mr. Shears has explained there has been a lot of theft and vandalism going on but I should like to put these documents on the record if the committee wishes so that in the end we may make some recommendation to the House or to the government that cases like this may be looked into and that justice be done to some of these Japanese whose property has been disposed of in such a way. I should like to hear Mr. Shear's comments.

Mr. GLADSTONE: Was your statement in error in one respect, as you gave it, Mr. Jaenicke? That is did the realization of $10 against the original value of $700 include boats.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-16
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Mr. JAENICKE: No, it does not include boats. If the committee likes I would put the statement on the record.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Was this appraisal done in the presence of Mr. Anderson?

Mr. JAENICKE: Yes.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I just want the point perfectly clear. It should be definite that Mr. Anderson was an official employee of the custodian's branch and he was present when the original estimate was made.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: May I suggest, Mr. Cruickshank, that you ask that question of Mr. Shears.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Mr. Jaenicke has just made the statement and this happens to be in my riding and I have been accused of a lot of things in connection with the Japanese so I would like to know.

Mr. JAENICKE: I am not accusing you of anything.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Just a moment, Mr. Chairman, if the valuation of the Japanese property was prepared by an officer of the government and was approved as $700 and the Japanese only got $10 out of it, I am very much interested.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Would you be good enough to table that inventory Mr. Jaenicke?

Mr. JAENICKE: Yes.

Mr. COTE: Before there is any motion put I would like to say this.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: There is no motion.

Mr. COTE: But we had better hear Mr. Shears.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen, I think you will appreciate it is not possible for me to have all the details of any specific case which you may bring to my attention. However, I would like to say this in regard to what has been read by Mr. Jaenicke. Mr. Anderson was an employee of the office of the custodian. Never, at any time, did he have any authority, nor did he attempt in any way to value any properties. If the Japanese was with him at that time, and it does seem rather likely, it is possible that he was in the area, if he were there at the time the inventory would probably be made when they were together. It is quite possible they listed all the articles together. The placing of any price against those articles would, however, be entirely the responsibility of the Japanese and no consent or approval in any shape or form would have been given by Mr. Anderson because that has been quite a distinct rule in our department. Mr. Anderson is not an appraiser. I think probably, because of his contacts with Japanese property, he has a better idea than I would have, or than some of you gentlemen would have. He was not there in any way to place prices on articles sold. I admit, if these figures are in any way accurate there seems to be a wide gap between what they were sold for and the original valuation. The point would be, what articles were actually sold of the original list? A number of them, for some reason or other, would not seem to have been sold at all. A specific analysis of the file would be necessary to reveal all the facts.

Mr. COTE: Would it be possible to get some information on this particular point in which I am very interested. I understand you are about to leave to return to the coast but would it be possible to send to the chairman or to Doctor Coleman all the particulars and facts pertaining to this particular case?

The WITNESS: I would certainly be willing to do that. The only thing which crosses my mind, and I think I am in order in saying this, is it has been indicated has it not, on the floor of the House, by the minister, that active consideration of claims is under way. Would that not be the time when the details of specific cases would be of greatest use. However if any particular case is requested we would only be too happy to supply the details.

Mr. COTE: If you require a motion I would be glad to put it.

Mr. SMITH: Even at $700, and taking the value at half of that, do you not think the committee should have some explanation. If you just take the articles which have been read off by Mr. Jaenicke, and, using our own figures as to what they might be worth, there is a discrepancy. A man gets less than $10 for the whole lot, and I think some explanation should be forthcoming.

Mr. JAENICKE: You can see for yourself the values are very reasonable.

Mr. COTE: I would be quite prepared to move that you send these particulars on to the chairman, Mr. Shears, leaving it to the chairman and to his steering committee to decide whether it is worth while opening a discussion on the particular case in the full committee.

Mr. FRASER: I wonder if the witness would say whether any other occasions such as this have come to his attention, where the depreciation has gone on to this extent.

The WITNESS: Yes, I would say that is true. I would say this too. It will be without a doubt possible for you to introduce some cases along the line of that which has now been indicated but there will be thousands where you will not find the same situation. I am not making this as a definite statement in regard to this particular case because I am not in a position to do so but just supposing it was shown the articles sold fetched a fair value for what was sold, and all the other articles disappeared. That would have been one of these cases, I admit, an extreme one, where our file might reveal something with regard to the disappearance by theft of all the articles. I do not want the committee to get the impression that in many cases everything in the house had disappeared. I am taking this as an extreme case. Possibly if such a considerable amount of goods were short of the amount of goods which were sold, the answer would be that the goods had been stolen.

Mr. FRASER: In this case you mentioned and these other cases, were these inventories made by men of your department or how were they made?

The WITNESS: In some cases they were supplied in the original declaration, then at a later date our men, as and when it was possible for them to do so, went around to all these various farms and checked up on the articles that were there. In this particular case it would appear Mr. Anderson was there when the Japanese was there and that would be proof positive that these articles were there. It would not, in my judgment, be proof positive of their value. It may or it may not have been right.

Mr. FLEMING: Mr. Chairman, I have a number of questions but to spread this around among the members quickly, I will confine myself to just one phase.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Is it on this particular question?

Mr. FLEMING: No, I want to turn now to the Fraser Valley farms.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: May we dispose of this first? Is it your request that the Chairman ask Doctor Coleman or Mr. Shears to give us further information with respect to this particular case?

Agreed.

Mr. PROBE: Mr. Chairman, I think the information contained there in the documents given to you by Mr. Jaenicke should be retained on the record. As I understand it that inventory form is the regulair form of the custodian's branch or a copy of it. It looks as though it has some official value and I believe the thing should be printed as it is there and reference made later on to it.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-17
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I would like to follow that up. I am also interested in this Fraser Valley. I think every member wants to do the fair thing by the Japanese. We may have been indiscreet in some things but not with respect to the value of goods taken. I do not know how much is involved, there may be hundreds of thousands of dollars, I cannot say. However, with my limited experience in Ottawa I do not see that there is any particular rush for Mr. Shears to return to British Columbia. It is a delightful country out there at any time of the year and I would like to be there myself now, but if there are hundreds of thousands of dollars involved I am not particular whether Mr. Shears goes back to British Columbia to-morrow or a month from now. As I understand it, the minister made a statement in the House that adjustments were necessary and they would have to be made. I think this committee is set up for the purpose of discovering whether any injustice has been done and we are then to make our recommendation. I think we are entitled to all the information we can get and I am not particularly worried about Mr. Shears going back to Vancouver. I would like to go back tomorrow, as I said. After all, Mr. Shears is an official and I think this committee should have whatever information is necessary from Vancouver. Mr. Shears might get that information and explain it to us when he gets it.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: I assure you, Mr. Cruickshank, that Mr. Shears will be kept here until such time as the committee decides otherwise. I mentioned that he was from British Columbia and the government is anxious that he return as quickly as possible but that is not sooner than he is able.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I would like to have this information as brought out by Mr. Jaenicke. I do not know whether it is correct and I do not think Mr. Jaenicke knows whether it is correct but I would like to have details and information brought from the office in Vancouver in order to have Mr. Shears explain it to this committee.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: You shall have that information.

Mr. COTE: Speaking to that request, Mr. Chairman, I rather think it would be more advisable, before printing the inventory tabled by Mr. Jaenicke, and the other documents, that we get the full reports on the other side of the picture and if necessary at that time we can have the whole thing printed in the same minutes of evidence.

Mr. JAENICKE: The only thing is, it will give you information as to the valuation of these articles and you can form your own opinions.

Mr. COTE: That is an individual case, Mr. Jaenicke. If it was a matter of higher policy you would be quite right, but this is an individual case. There may be a full explanation to account for this particular case and it would be unfair to let all this go into the minutes of evidence here without a proper answer which Mr. Shears is not in a position to give today.

The WITNESS: Just for the purpose of the record it is written right at the top of this sheet, "List made by custodian, owner's valuation added". I am merely putting that down for the purpose of the record. I definitely do not agree that this is a valuation made by an employee in my office.

Mr. JAENICKE: I did not say that.

Mr. FLEMING: We all understand that.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, if we are going to print anything it should be printed in one piece, that is the only fair way.

The CHAIRMAN: In the meantime, we will table it and the clerk will be the custodian of the papers.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Mr. Shears, may I ask you a few questions in regard to the farms of the Fraser Valley area? As I followed the evidence given by Mr. Shears yesterday it indicated that in this group of farms there was a total of 769 of which about 20 were not in the Fraser Valley.—A. Yes, I said that. There may have been 30 to 40 relatively the bulk of them were in the Fraser Valley.

Q. Were those outside the Fraser Valley included in the sale to the Soldiers' Settlement Board?—A. Definitely yes. They were in the same offer but some of them were on the mainland and there were a few over on Vancouver Island but it was quite a limited number.

Q. The Soldiers' Settlement Board got the full 769 for the price which you mentioned yesterday, namely $836,000?—A. No, excuse me, I think we should have this just right. There was an offer on 768 parcels. That was the original offer. There was a subsequent offer.

Q. What was the amount of that offer?—A. That was an offer from the Soldiers' Settlement Board?—A. Yes, 768 parcels, and the offer was $750,000. It was raised to $850,000 and that is the point, gentlemen, that we have got to make clear. The offer was for 768 parcels but we were not able to deliver title to all those 768 parcels.

An Hon. MEMBER: For what reason?

The WITNESS: I will come to that in a minute. There were 768 parcels in the first offer; 55 properties in a second offer which was considered by the advisory committees; and we had to withdraw some 60 odd properties and the actual number finally sold to the Veterans' Land Act was 741. The reason for the withdrawal of those 60 parcels was in part this: 20 of them, approximately, had no Japanese interest at all. The other 41, in a number of cases, were in the name of a deceased Japanese and the sale of that property had to be handled through an official administrator. In some cases there were encumbrances against the property greater than the Veterans' Land Act offer and for that reason they were withdrawn. When the sale was consummated in was consummated on the basis of an acceptable offer of $850,000 against $867,000 valuation of the properties in the first offer. Could I put it this way?

This is a copy of the offer. The Japanese name the appraised value, and the sale price. The sale price is 1·7 per cent, a little less than 2 per cent, lower than the appraisal. After a property was withdrawn it was just withdrawn on that basis.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. I do not know whether that was quite clear Mr. Shears. Probably we can clear it up with a question or two. Now the offer which was finally accepted was 741 properties all of which belonged to Japanese?—A. Yes.

Q. They were sold for a total of $836,256?—A. Definitely.

Q. And some other properties were taken out of the larger group because they were not the property of Japanese?—A. Yes, and also 41 properties that belonged to Japanese which we could not convey were taken out because they belonged to deceased persons and they were not sold to the Veterans' Land Act people.

Q. Some of those would be included in those 50 that you said were not sold? —A. I think they have all been sold.

Q. Let us confine ourselves to the 741 that were sold. An appraisal was made by the superintendent of the Soldiers' Settlement Board.—A. By the Soldiers' Settlement Board of Canada, I think that is the title.

Q. Yes, and their appraisal of those 741 properties was exactly how much? I think you gave the figure yesterday of $847,000?—A. Yes, $847,878.

Q. We are clear on that.—A. That would be right, yes.

Q. Now had your office made any appraisal apart from the appraisal of the Soldiers' Settlement Board?—A. Not at the time the offer was being dealt with. The advisory committee made some examination into some of the

Source: Nikkei National Museum 2018.16.1.45.1.18
www.nikkeimuseum.org

properties before they recommended the acceptance of the offer. That was a valuation they made then.

Q. May I inquire if there was any general valuation made by your office before this offer was received or made by the Veterans' Land Act officials?—A. There was not.

Q. Now you say there was a check made of some properties. How many properties were checked as to valuation before the acceptance of the offer?—A. I think 17 or 18 properties.

Q. 17 or 18 out of 741?—A. Yes.

Q. And remembering apart from the fact this was a cash offer and a bulk offer, were there any other reasons you would like to mention which would lead your office to recommend government acceptance of this offer? I want to get the whole picture and to make sure you are perfectly fair.—A. This offer was negotiated between the advisory committee of the custodian and the committee of the Department of Veterans' Land Affairs. Representatives of the two committees sat together and as a result of their negotiations the advisory committee under Judge Whiteside recommended to the custodian that, in view of all the circumstances, the purpose for which those lands were required, the fact that the custodian would be relieved of a certain amount of carrying charges, the offer should be accepted and that offer was finally accepted.

Q. Those are the points I mentioned, and I take it we have before us all the factors that led to the acceptance of this offer?—A. Yes.

Q. You mentioned yesterday a figure of assessment of $1,250,940. I take it that figure is the assessment of the 741 properties.—A. Yes.

Q. Now, have you within your knowledge information as to the terms on which these properties were then sold from the Soldiers' Settlement Board to the veterans?—A. That is not our department of course, but I am advised that when the director of the Veteran's Land Act sells these properties to a returned man he sells them at precisely the amount which he paid the custodian plus any improvements that they themselves have made. That is to say the Veterans' Land Act bought the property for $2,000 and the returning soldier would buy the property for $2,000 from the director of the Veterans' Land Act. I think I am right in that statement but of course it is not my department.

Q. Well you feel quite certain about it and perhaps the chairman could arrange to have that information confirmed. Now, let us go on to the distribution of the proceeds. You start with a certain valuation made by the Soldiers' Settlement Board. When you started to break down the proceeds of the $836,000 among the Japanese owners on what basis did you proceed?—A. Originally the offer was for that number of properties for that sum of money, giving an itemized list of all properties on which they were bidding. For example our file number 11,060, Veterans' Land Act number 75, the Japanese name was S. Sukawa. Their appraisal of that property was $1,158. Then if you added up all the totals of the 700 odd parcels it would have come to $857,000 all from the first offer. The sale was then computed to the exact decimal point because of the fact that the advisory committee recommended acceptance of the $850,000 as against the valuation of $867,000.

Q. To put it briefly the distribution of the proceeds among the Japanese was based on the appraisal of the Soldiers' Settlement Board and worked out on a pro rata basis against the total price?—A. Correct.

Q. What steps did you take to notify the Japanese concerned of that appraisal?—A. There was a statement sent out to each Japanese showing the price at which his property had been sold to the director of the Veterans' Land Act. On the same statement there would show the disbursements, that is his share of the taxes and fire insurance and I think that would be about all.

Q. And how many owners were there in the 741 properties? Were they all individually owned?—A. I would say yes. There would be some slight difference

because there would be joint interests in a few cases but I would say approximately 700 owners would be concerned.

Q. Did you have replies from them?—A. I would say in the Vancouver office we might have had 300 letters of complaints. That, of course, may or may not indicate that all the people who wished to complain did so because when we received these letters of complaints we replied, stating as I have mentioned before, that their letter was being filed for record purposes. I think it is a fact that the Japanese population as a whole, living in these camps, would understand that if one Japanese complained and received that letter they would all receive such letters and they might not have troubled to write us. I do not know whether that is the explanation but it could be.

Q. How does that number of complaints with reference to the total number of persons affected, compare with the record of complaints that were received regarding the disposal of other types of Japanese property?—A. Well, I am frank in saying here that practically all complaints which have been received have been in connection with these farm lands which were sold to the director of the Veterans' Land Act.

Q. I take it to be a fact from what you said yesterday that your office really had not any particular part to play beyond accepting this particular offer. It was a matter of government policy.—A. It was a matter of negotiation between these two government departments and our local Vancouver office did not enter into the picture in regard to the sales of that group as we did in regard to other properties.

Q. The decision was a government decision?—A. Yes.

Q. A matter of government policy. Just a question in passing. Of the owners of the 741 properties would you know how many were naturalized British subjects resident in Canada?—A. No, I am sorry.

Q. You did not keep any records?—A. In so far as our department is concerned in administering the affairs of the Japanese there was no distinction. An evacuee was not an enemy and whether he was a national or naturalized or Canadian born. It made no difference to the administration of his property and the disposal of it when liquidation came into effect.

Q. That answer would apply to all property of persons of the Japanese race?—A. All evacuees.

Q. There was no distinction drawn between their status in any respect?—A. No, there were of course some Japanese classed as enemies but I am speaking of evacuees.

Q. Have all the owners of the 741 properties now received the proceeds of the sales or in some cases are the proceeds still held by the custodian?—A. The overall picture at the moment is this, that we have approximately 1,600 accounts which have credit balances. They are being sent out just as fast as they can be sent out. They are not being held for any reason at all. In some cases we have sent out money to a Japanese and the cheque has been returned saying that he does not wish to accept it and so that money of course goes back to the credit of his account.

Q. You are speaking of the overall picture?—A. Yes.

Q. When you speak of 1,600 accounts?—A. Yes.

Q. I am speaking only of the persons intitled to sale proceeds from the sale of the 741 properties.—A. I could not give you that proportion but as I say there are credit balances for 1,600 Japanese.

Q. That is another subject to which I would like to come back a little later. You cannot, however, from the knowledge of your records now, tell me how many cases of owners of the 741 properties have received in full the proceeds of the sale of their parcel.—A. No, I can only say that the majority have received their money.

Source: Nikkei National Museum 2018.16.1-45.19
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Q. And amongst them how many do you think have refused to accept it?—A. I think about 30 or 40.

Q. Thirty or 40 out of the majority?—A. Yes, that number returned their cheques.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Ten per cent roughly.

The WITNESS: Yes.

By Mr. Probe:

Q. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a few questions to follow up what Mr. Fleming has been asking with respect to the land held at one time by Japanese nationals, or naturalized Japanese.

Mr. FLEMING: You had better not call them Japanese nationals.

Mr. PROBE: No, I will change that to persons of the Japanese race. Yesterday, in the evidence, the witness accepted a phrase with respect to this land. Perhaps I should ask him whether he did accept the statement with respect to this land but the suggestion was it was already burned out in the sense that it was no longer productive farming land. Might I have his comment on that for the record to-day because I would like to get that matter cleared up? That is as to whether or not it was or was not fit for production.—A. As I stated yesterday I am not a farmer and I merely stated that I have been advised that a number of these properties were in the class of what was termed burned out lands. I do not think that means they were entirely non-productive. I think by putting in more fertilizer and that sort of thing the land would still be productive. That is somewhat of a technical matter and beyond my knowledge but this information has come to us in a general way.

Q. In general would you say these lands were suitable for further farming? That is, they are still suitable for the use of the soldiers to whom they were ultimately sold.—A. I would say that was true, but as I say that would be a question for a person who understood agriculture more than I do.

Q. As far as burned out valuation is concerned the suggestion came from one of the members of the committee rather than from the custodian's department.—A. No, that statement, as a matter of fact, has been a general statement in and around the Vancouver area and the statement did not come from the committee. I am just saying that is generally accepted in Vancouver and the Fraser Valley area that many of the Japanese farms would have been termed as burned out, but they were still producing and I take it can still be productive.

Q. Would you be able to inform us as to what is the general nature of the production of the lands that were occupied by these evacuees from their own production or production that has been obtained since they left? I am not as familiar with that area as would be the member from Fraser Valley. I do not know the country as a whole.—A. They are what might be called small berry farms, raspberries, strawberries and so on, but Mr. Cruickshank might be able to say something there.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I certainly intend to say something when you are through.

By Mr. Probe:

Q. Well, was the land productive generally, following the removal of these persons from the Fraser Valley? Was it kept in production?—A. Very little of it went out of production. Arrangements were made by the Japanese themselves before their evacuation, in co-operation generally with the Pacific Co-operative Union, that white tenants be placed on the farms. Sometimes the white persons were on the land even before the Japanese were evacuated. Broadly speaking, all the farms had some tenant placed upon them within a [illegible]

Q. That would be covered by some form of cropping arrangement whereby the evacuee would receive his proper share of the produce of that farm?—A. In all cases, I think I might say, it was an outright sale of the crop for that particular year. That is to say the Japanese contacted a white tenant and the white tenant said "I will pay you $600," for instance, "for the use of your property and for the growing of the crop". From that time on, of course, the white tenant had to cultivate it and had to take the crop off.

Q. Might I ask further, in connection with these holdings, was the farm machinery which had been part of each farm left on the farm when the Japanese evacuee left?—A. The farm machinery stayed with the land for the use of the white tenant during the term of his lease. That lease was for one year and in most cases it was renewed for the following year. It was renewed up until the time when these properties were sold to the director of the Veterans' Land Act. At that time the tenants who were on the land became the tenants of the Veterans' Land Act.

Q. Was the machinery valued separately in connection with the appraisal that was made for the purpose of selling out their interests?—A. The offer of the Veterans' Land Act was for the real estate only, the buildings and so on, but not the equipment.

Q. And such things as machinery, livestock, automobiles, and trucks would be disposed of through ordinary channels other than those involved in this arrangement between the custodian and the Soldiers' Settlement Board?—A. Those items were vested in the custodian and were disposed of by the means I outlined yesterday, that is advertising and calling for tenders or, if it was the type of article that could be sold at auction it was sold at auction.

Q. With respect to the land, I presume the land was asked for by the officials of the Veterans' Land Act rather than offered by the custodian to the Veterans' Land Act. I would just like to know whether your department suggested to the Veterans' Land Act that they buy these properties or whether that came about with the offer?—A. I can only say in regard to this particular offer, as already indicated, that it was the result of negotiations between the two governmental departments and not at Vancouver. The Vancouver office did not really come into the picture until after the deal had been consummated.

Q. That is the custodian is simply a third party in negotiations that happened to take place between the Veterans' Land Act or shall we say, the secretary of state and the Department of Veterans' Affairs. Those would be the two departments involved in those negotiations.—A. My understanding is that the deal originated, and of course it would naturally come from the Department of Veterans' Affairs. Knowing of these properties in the Fraser Valley and considering it desirable that they should be held for returned soldiers, I presume the Department of Veterans' Affairs would approach the department which had control of these lands by vesting at that particular time. Those two departments entered into negotiations and the deal was considered by the advisory committee and acceptance was made. It was only at that time that the Vancouver office came into the picture for the purpose of the mechanics of transferring the properties.

Q. May I ask if the Department of Veterans Affairs rejected any parcels because of the burned out feature? I presume they would have had their own inspectors working on this?—A. No, all the properties on which they offered except those which were withdrawn by the Custodian were sold.

Q. Now, then, what was the total acreage that was bought out at this price of $850,000 or is it $836,000?—A. I am afraid that on an acreage basis I could not venture an opinion.

Q. You could not give me or the committee an idea of the average acreage of the farms?—A. Yes, but there again, as I mentioned before in connection with the average price of $1,158, one property was sold at $10,000 and another

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-20
www.nikkeimuseum.org

at $200. These farms were generally small farms, one acre, two acres, five acres and so on.

Q. Would it be more correct to say they were small holdings rather than farms and surely there is an average that we could strike with respect to this?—A. They were small holdings, yes.

Q. Have you any comments to offer on what the assessment procedure is in the Fraser Valley with respect to these lands because I judge, since you have had numerous letters protesting the sale price, the owners wanted more than they got. Is there any basis for their complaint? How is the assessment worked out in the areas where this land was sold? In my city, for example, we have an arbitrary assessment for land and a 30 per cent valuation for buildings.—A. I would not be positive about this but I think land is assessed at its full value and improvements are assessed at 50 or 60 per cent. However, I would rather not make a positive statement in regard to that.

Q. Mr. Jacnicke corrects me and tells me that in Saskatchewan they set the assessment at 60 per cent of the value of the buildings.—A. As a matter of fact they sometimes have an assessed value and a value for taxation purposes but just what the valuation is I do not know.

Q. In general would you say it is incorrect to say that the custodian has sold poor quality land to the veterans in this proposition, the 741 parcels? That is to say the land generally was quite productive.—A. The land was certainly productive.

Q. I wonder why it was that there were 60 properties that were originally offered that were withdrawn from the sale?—A. It has been indicated before that 60 odd properties were withdrawn. Twenty were withdrawn because the Japanese had no interest. In 41 cases there was a Japanese interest but the custodian was not in a position to deliver the title. These properties have been sold since. They have been sold in many cases by the official administrator in co-operation with the custodian but in other cases they have been sold directly by the custodian when at a later time the custodian had cleared up defective titles. The reason they were withdrawn was at that time the custodian was not in position to deliver title. At a later date either the custodian or the official administrator was in a position to deliver the title and those properties were then sold.

Q. Not necessarily to the Veterans' Land Act?—A. No, not necessarily to the Veterans' Land Act.

Q. To private individuals.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a couple of questions myself regarding the Fraser Valley. I would like to have as a matter of record the sale price by the custodian to the Soldiers' Settlement Board. I want this on the record in the case of each parcel of land. In other words I want the price that was paid to the Japanese. The reason I want that is that I happen to be a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and interested in seeing that the government should not be allowed to exploit the veteran by buying a piece of land for $1,000 and selling it to the veteran for $2,000. I want the exact price on each parcel of land bought from the Japanese. I think too much has been said about this burned out land and I am only sorry that the farmers from Saskatchewan are not familiar with the good farming husbandry that we have in the Fraser Valley. They will not know what we mean by burned out land. In the province of British Columbia it has quite a different meaning from, for instance, burned out lands in the province of Saskatchewan. Burned out land in the province of British Columbia in particular the berry farm, is not caused from such things as drought. I want to make this quite clear because nobody is going to say that the Fraser Valley is burned out. Berry farming by the very highly organized farming as everyone will appreciate. On the

here of firms selling the stuff. If anybody knows anything about farming and using chemical fertilizer they know that such fertilizer will eventually burn out the land. In the Fraser Valley the average berry farm is a small farm. This might be an Irish way of saying it, but the largest farm would not be over ten acres and the average farm will have about five acres under cultivation. The farm is very intensively farmed and as I have said it has to be kept in condition by the use of chemical fertilizer. That is what we mean by burned out land or farm land which has been mined. I made a statement, and I repeat it now, a very large percentage of these farms in the Fraser Valley were burned out, being over mined, because such fertilizers had been put on the land. In most cases, of necessity, it was chemical fertilizer which was put on the land. Nobody is here to dispute the fact that the Japanese were energetic and good workers, and nobody is here, so far as British Columbia is concerned, at least, to say they were not capable and efficient farmers, particularly in small areas. I am sure Mr. Green will agree with me in that.

I am digressing slightly at the moment because too much attention has been paid to a remark made by Mr. Probe yesterday, "How could they afford to buy these frigidaires if the land was burned out?" I could give you one reason for that. I know of one Japanese farmer who was working at the age of 94, seven days a week; that is one of the reasons. They were able—while the land may have been to a certain extent mined out—to buy frigidaires and such equipment because of their long hours of work. Incidentally, I may say a very small percentage of them had frigidaires because a very small percentage of the Japanese farmers had electricity on their farms. I was just using the word as a term. However, the Japanese work from the time they are four years old until they are ninety years of age, seven days a week.

I heard someone say, "What hours do they work,"? They work up to 18 hours a day. In my own municipality, adopting some of the methods of the lawyers, I had a by-law passed to prohibit them working on Sunday. By pure bluff, I got away with it. They told me I had to go to the Lord's Day Alliance Act. You might just as well try to get something out of one of these government departments as to get something from the Lord's Day Alliance Act. However, I bluffed it through and stopped them working on Sundays. It was for this reason they were able to buy those things. They worked long hours.

Last year, we paid berry pickers in the province of British Columbia as much as we received for the berries in the previous year. We actually paid the pickers as much as we received for the product. By working 18 hours a day, by working all the members of the family from the grandmothers to the grandchildren, the Japanese were able to do these things.

I want to make that very clear. I do not want to dwell on the burned out land. Any land must be kept up. I think everybody knows it.

I disagree with the witness as to the condition of the farms when the Japanese vacated. They were not properly farmed and had not been properly farmed. I am speaking of 90 per cent of the farms. In the production of berries, you must keep your farm replanted and heavily fertilized to keep it up. These farms were leased on a year-to-year basis. I leave it up to anyone of you; do you think anyone is going to take a farm, go in and clean it up and replant it when he is only there for a year? Those farms were not kept in condition and are not in condition now.

As the Fraser Valley has been mentioned, and as most of these Japanese berry farms are in my riding, I must say that now they are just pieces of land. They are not farms in most cases. They have grown up with willows, and to take them over would be like taking over a piece of raw land. They would have to be cleaned up.

The CHAIRMAN: What would be the average size?

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2016.16.145.22
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Ten acres. There is one farm which has been sold in the Mission area. I understand it has been sold for a monastery. It is not worth $100 for the whole farm, as a farm. The Japanese, apparently being so accustomed in their own country, were capable and willing to farm the hillsides and the mountain slopes. The average berry farm, I am confident, would not equal ten acres. Although the property in question might be over ten acres—it might have 25 acres according to the tax notice—there would only be seven acres of that land under cultivation. I think that is general throughout the province of British Columbia. It certainly applies to the Fraser Valley. The assessment roll might indicate there was more property, but only a small percentage of that is actually under cultivation.

Mr. JAENICKE: What is the customary rental basis for these farms in that district?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Previous to this evacuation of the Japanese, it was very seldom a berry farm was rented. I do not think there would be half a dozen berry farms rented in the province of British Columbia. It is not practical because of the limited scale of operations in berry farming.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions?

Mr. GREEN: What about the difference between the assessed value and the appraisal value?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: In the Fraser Valley, there are about 17 municipalities affected. Each municipality has a different scale of assessment. Some municipalities have never assessed or taxed improvements at all. Let me put it another way. The city of New Westminster, I think, is the only city of any size in Canada which does not tax improvements. I do not think you could arrive at a valuation of farm land from assessed value. Some municipalities adopt the principle of a high mill rate and a low assessment, and other municipalities adopt the principle of a low mill rate and a high assessment; that is common.

Mr. PROBE: You have no assessment commission?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Each municipality sets its own assessment. I think that was true until this year. I think the Goldberg report suggests there be a new assessment made by the provincial authorities for school purposes; that is for the 1947 assessment. I know nothing about it. I have had mostly municipal farm experience and I would say you cannot arrive at a valuation of the land on the basis of the assessment. I believe that is so in most municipalities across Canada.

There was one statement made by the witness with which I disagree. He said there was an assessed value and a value for taxation purposes. I disagree with that entirely.

The WITNESS: I say there are assessment notices without doubt which are in our office which have the assessed valuation and the valuation for taxation purposes. I would not say that was so in the Fraser Valley, but there are such notices.

Mr. FLEMING: In some cases there are exemptions?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Oh well, there may be exemptions but I am saying it is not possible to have an assessed value and a value for taxation in the province of British Columbia. I am speaking from memory. Until this year, we were only permitted to tax 50 per cent of the improvements; I think 50 per cent which was the maximum. This year it was raised to 75 per cent.

I am speaking for the veterans who are acquiring these farms, have acquired them or are acquiring them. They are not able to enter into a discussion as to what we paid—when I say "we" I mean the Department of Veterans Affairs paid the Japanese for the land. We are determined the government shall not exploit those prices on the resale to the veterans. If there is an adjustment to

be made—I want this to be put on the record to be perfectly clear—I do not think there is anybody in the Fraser Valley who wants to see any injustice done to those Japanese. Whether they were paid enough, I do not know. I do not think anybody else can tell. I do know the men who were on the advisory board. Judge Whiteside, is one of the men of whom I am speaking and Mr. Menzies is another. Mr. Menzies has lived in the centre of the Japanese area for thirty years. I happen to be the person who recommended Mr. Menzies as a member of that board. He is a capable man in real estate. He is a man who resided right in the area. I presume he gave a fair valuation.

There is such a vast difference between the value of farm land, as between 1942 and 1947 in any part of British Columbia, that to-day's values cannot be taken into consideration. Values have trebled in the Fraser Valley. Land which sold in 1942 for $150, which was considered a good price at that time, has sold this year for $600. In so far as farm values are concerned, there can be no comparison between 1942 and 1947.

I do want that point to be clear. When I referred to burnt out land, that is common in any part of Canada, and particularly in connection with intensive farming. For instance, your Niagara Peninsula is one of the finest districts in Canada, and certainly the only good district you have in Ontario, but it would be burnt out if you did not constantly keep that property up. It is the same wherever you have intensive farming.

Mr. JAENICKE: How can you recondition that land?

Mr. CLEAVER: By adding humus to the land.

Mr. FLEMING: May I have a couple of minutes to ask a few questions in connection with this matter?

The CHAIRMAN: I caught Mr. Cote's signal, so you will have a couple of minutes and Mr. Cote will be the last.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Mr. Shears, do you know who made the valuation on behalf of the Soldiers' Settlement Board?—A. No, I do not. It was the Soldiers' Settlement Board valuators, that is the only title I have.

Q. We will have to get that from that department, then?—A. Yes.

Q. You mentioned that you have had valuations made of 17 of the 741 properties. I presume that was as a sort of check against the offer, is that correct?—A. The Advisory Committee had that check made.

Q. Who made the valuation of the 17 properties?—A. The members of the committee themselves, Mr. MacKenzie and Mr. Menzies.

Q. Did they take along an independent valuator?—A. I could not say. They reported back to the committee that they had appraised 17 properties and they brought the result to the committee.

Q. Have you those results?—A. I am not sure whether I have them here, but those valuations they brought back to the committee were all higher than the Soldiers' Settlement appraisal.

Q. Within what area were those 17 properties located?—A. They just checked the spot valuations throughout the group of lands.

Q. Then, you can furnish the committee with the particular properties, the valuations made by the committee in each case?—A. Yes.

Q. And you are gong to do that along with these other items for which Mr. Cruickshank has asked, namely, the settled purchase price of each property?—A. Yes.

Q. You mentioned later there were 60 additional properties sold. Did I understand you correctly?—A. There was what was called an addition to this number of properties and that was also sold on the same basis, that is to say, it was the Soldiers' Settlement appraisal and the properties were sold exactly

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-22
www.nikkeimuseum.org

at the same percentage differential, less than 2 per cent of the valuation. So you could put the whole deal together.

Q. That is to say, these properties were all sold to the one private purchaser, is that correct?—A. They were sold to the Veterans' Land Act, a second offer, an additional offer, I will call it.

Q. And the basis was precisely the same?—A. Precisely the same, yes.

Mr. Probe: That is not the way I understood your answer.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. That is not what I have noted when Mr. Probe was questioning you. You said they were sold to private purchasers.—A. They were properties withdrawn from the Veterans' Land Act. There were 60 odd properties withdrawn, 20 did not belong to the Japanese and 40 have been advertised and sold either by the custodian or the administrator.

By Mr. Cruickshank:

Q. Is it not correct that some of these properties were sold by the Japanese direct, themselves?—A. No, not these particular properties. There were properties sold by the Japanese, but not these particular properties.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. We have it straight; there were 60 sold through your office to private purchasers?—A. Forty-one.

Q. What was the valuation of those properties on which you based your selling price; how was it made?—A. They were independent appraisals which I had made in line with the valuations which were made on the other 900 properties to which I referred yesterday.

Q. They were made by independent valuators in the area?—A. In the area, yes.

Q. Were appraisals made on any of those by appraisers for the Soldiers' Settlement Board?—A. I did not catch your question. Originally in the offer, they had been valued by the Soldiers' Settlement people, but they were withdrawn and then they were valued—

Q. Then. you had a fresh appraisal made of them?—A. Yes, we had a fresh appraisal made.

Q. Can you give us a list of the forty-one properties with the two appraisals, the first appraisal by the Soldiers' Settlement Board and the second appraisal made by your independent appraiser?—A. Yes, that is quite easily available, except, I would say this, rather than give the two appraisals we could give the prices at which the properties were sold.

Q. To give the committee the complete picture then, would you submit a list of the 41 properties with the three figures opposite each, the first appraisal by the Soldiers' Settlement Board, the second appraisal made by your office's independent appraisers and third, the selling price in each case?—A. Yes, I can give you the first two right here and will secure from Vancouver, the second appraisal—I can give the Soldiers' Settlement appraisal and I can give you the custodian's selling price.

Q. It would be better to give it to us complete, would it not?

Mr. Case: I had a suggestion to make in connection with a question asked by Mr. Cruickshank. He has asked for a list of the properties, their values and so on, and there have been some questions asked about the average number of acres per farm. Would it be helpful to have the acreage of each of the properties?

Mr. Cruickshank: I presumed that would be on the list of properties?

The Witness: I would not be able to give you the acreage.

The Chairman: If you want the 741 properties listed along the lines as outlined by Mr. Fleming, it is within your power to ask for it—

Mr. Cruickshank: That is exactly what I do want.

The Chairman: I do not know whether you heard the answer given by Mr. Shears. He said all the 741 properties sold to the DVA were re-sold to the veterans at exactly the same price.

Mr. Cruickshank: With all due deference to you, that is not according to the facts which I have. I am not saying Mr. Shears is responsible for the Department of Veterans Affairs, that is out of his jurisdiction.

The Chairman: The committee desires the 741?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, and that can be compared with the witness from the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The Chairman: Gentlemen, just before you leave, would it be possible to meet this afternoon? Is it your pleasure to do so, otherwise we would not meet until next week. I am not, as a rule, in favour of holding meetings while the House is in session. I have stated my position on that on more than one occasion in other committees. If it is your wish we should meet this afternoon, we could meet again at four o'clock.

Mr. Fleming: I doubt very much now if we are going to finish Mr. Shears to-day. Of course, that may not be a reason why we should not meet this afternoon, but there are a lot of other matters to be covered yet.

The Chairman: Then, we will adjourn until Monday morning at eleven o'clock.

The committee adjourned at 1.05 p.m. to meet again on Monday, May 12, 1947, at 11.00 a.m.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-23
www.nikkeimuseum.org

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

MONDAY, May 12, 1947.

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts met at 11 o'clock a.m.

Members present: Messrs. Boucher, Burton, Case, Cockeram, Cruickshank, Dechene, Fleming, Gladstone, Golding, Grant, Jaenicke, Johnston, Kirk, Pinard, Smith (*Calgary West*), Stewart (*Winnipeg North*), Winkler.

In attendance: Dr. E. H. Coleman, C.M.G., K.C., Deputy Custodian of Enemy Property; Mr. F. G. Shears, Director of the Vancouver Office; and Mr. K. W. Wright, Counsel.

On motion of Mr. Golding,

Resolved: That in the absence of both the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman, Mr. Roch Pinard act as Chairman.

The Acting Chairman, Mr. Roch Pinard, took the Chair and thanked the members for the honour bestowed upon him.

The Committee resumed its investigation into the administration of the Vancouver office of the Custodian.

Examination of Mr. Shears was continued.

The witness supplied the Committee with information requested at the meeting of Friday, May 9, 1947, relating to the sale of 741 parcels of land, and was questioned thereon.

The witness filed a copy of Order in Council P.C. 5523, dated Monday, the 29th day of June, 1942, which is printed as Exhibit "A" to this day's minutes of proceedings and evidence.

On motion of Mr. Stewart (*Winnipeg North*),

Ordered,—That the minutes of the Advisory Committee to the Custodian, in the matter of the sale of 741 parcels of land, be produced at the earliest possible date.

On motion of Mr. Fleming,

Ordered,—That the balance of the correspondence between the Advisory Committee to the Custodian, the Department of the Secretary of State and the authorities of the Veterans' Land Act, relating to the sale of the 741 parcels of land, be made available to the Committee.

The witness supplied the Commitee with a full report concerning the disposal of inventory of chattels left on the property of one Naochi Karatus.

On motion of Mr. Jaenicke,

Ordered,—That the original papers concerning the said Naochi Karatus, which were tabled by Mr. Jaenicke at the previous meeting of the Committee be printed as Appendix "B" to this day's proceedings and evidence.

At 1.05 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned until Tuesday, May 13, 1947, at 11 o'clock a.m.

ANTOINE CHASSE,
Acting Clerk of the Committee.

88035—1½

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-24
www.nikkeimuseum.org

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
May 12, 1947

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts met this day at 11.00 a.m. The Acting Chairman, Mr. Roch Pinard, presided.

Mr. GOLDING: Gentlemen, we have a quorum. Mr. Isnor will be away to-day, so I will move that Mr. Pinard take the chair for this meeting.

Carried.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, I wish to express my appreciation of this privilege you have extended to me. I hope I will be able to conduct the meeting properly. I understand the order of business for to-day is to have Mr. Shears resume his testimony. Before we proceed with that, I think Mr. Shears has a statement to make in connection with his testimony at the last meeting. I should like to ask that the privilege be given Mr. Shears of making such a statement.

Frank G. Shears, Director of the office of the Custodian, Vancouver, recalled:

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, on several occasions during this enquiry reference has been made to the figures in connection with the sale of farm lands to the Veterans' Land Act. For the purpose of the record, I should like to clarify this matter in the minds of the members of the committee and show the reconciliation between the offer and the actual sale. I have a few copies of a statement containing those figures which some members of the committee might wish to have in order to follow the statement as I read it to you.

Two offers were received from the director of the Veterans' Land Act, one in May, 1942, for 768 parcels, the appraised value of which was $865,672. This appraisal was made by the Soldier Settlement of Canada under order in council No. P.C. 5523, dated the 29th of June, 1942. The offer was $850,000, and that offer was finally accepted by the custodian. On a certain number of parcels, the offer was increased to the extent of $3,817.

In October, 1943, a further offer on 42 parcels was received. The Soldier Settlement appraisal on this land was $45,484. The offer accepted was $44,573, making a total offer on 810 parcels, with an appraised value of $911,156, and an accepted offer of $893,390.

As has been previously indicated, the custodian was not in a position to give title to those 810 properties. Twenty-six of them had either been previously sold by the Japanese or, in some cases, there was no Japanese interest in the properties at all. These 26 properties were, therefore, withdrawn.

Then, there were 43 properties of deceased estates or where the encumbrances on the property were greater than the amount of the offer or where the title was in such shape that it needed to be cleared up before a conveyance could be made. The number of such properties was 43. The Soldier Settlement appraisal on these parcels was $39,591, and the V.L.A. offer was $38,876. Then, when the deduction of these two items is made, you have the figures which have been

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-25
www.nikkeimuseum.org

quoted before, a sale of 741 properties appraised at $847,878 and sold for $836,256. The municipal assessment on that group of 741 parcels was $1,215,940, and the approximate acreage of those 741 parcels was 10,000 acres.

Now, with those figures I think we at least know to what reference has been made in the past. There has been a little confusion between the difference in the number of parcels on which offers were made and the number of properties sold. These offers, gentlemen, were received by the custodian. Negotiations took place between the regional commitee of the Veterans' Land Act consisting of Mr. J. Godfrey, Mr. J. J. McLellan and Mr. G. Carneross. Negotiations were carried on between that committee and the advisory committee of the custodian under the chairmanship of Judge Whiteside. The advisory committee were informed that the Soldier Settlement valuators had been actively engaged in valuating farm lands since 1935 for farm adjustment and other purposes and that that board was an official agency with an adequate trained staff, qualified to make appraisals.

The members of that regional committee stated that, in regard to these properties on which they were making an offer, only 10 per cent of the properties were what they described as being low land where, apparently a higher productivity takes place. It was stated there was no comparison of the yield between high and low land, and that the high land had been farmed intensively and the soil values were petering out. It was also stated that an average of several hundred dollars would have to be spent on the various houses in order to make them habitable. The recommendation of the advisory committee was conveyed to the Honourable Secretary of State at Ottawa on June 14, 1943, by Judge David Whiteside. The letter reads as follows:

> Dear Sir,—A meeting of the advisory committee at which I presided was held in my chambers on Tuesday, 1st June, 1943, at 2.30 p.m. Members of the committee present were Mr. D. E. MacKenzie and Mr. Hal Menzies.
>
> Mr. F. G. Shears, Acting Director of the Custodian's office in Vancouver, submitted and read correspondence which had taken place since the last meeting of the committee held on May 24, between Mr. I. T. Barnet, District Superintendent of the Soldier Settlement of Canada and Mr. G. W. McPherson.
>
> A letter from Mr. G. Murchison, Director of the Soldier Settlement and Veterans' Land Act, dated from Ottawa, May 29, 1943, addressed to Mr. G. W. McPherson, Executive Assistant, office of the Custodian, Department of the Secretary of State, Ottawa, was also read in which a revised offer of $850,000 was submitted covering the purchase of 769 parcels of land.
>
> After the committee had fully considered the proposal a unanimous recommendation was made that the offer be accepted. In making this recommendation, consideration was given to the following facts:
>
> (a) That the committee concurs in the policy of liquidation of Japanese properties in the protected area of British Columbia as provided for in order in council P.C. 469.
>
> (b) That the purpose for which such lands are required is for the rehabilitation of returned soldiers.
>
> (c) That the offer is not for selected individual parcels but for a block of 769 parcels which include a large proportion of uncultivated land and a considerable amount of bush land.
>
> (d) That while the appraisals of 17 farms made by this committee were in excess of the appraisals of the Soldier Settlement of Canada, it was realized that present values are enhanced due to war conditions and do not represent ordinary land values as in normal times.
>
> (e) That the present offer is for cash and can therefore be reasonably expected to be less than the appraised value in view of the interest which may accrue by investment of the purchase funds.
>
> (f) That the Custodian will be relieved of the cost of administration, taxes, fire insurance, depreciation.
>
> The committee, therefore, are of the opinion that the offer of $850,000 was fair and reasonable and recommend to the Custodian that the offer be accepted.
>
> This recommendation is set forth in the Minutes of the Committee.
>
> (Signed) D. WHITESIDE,
> *Chairman of Advisory Committee.*

Mr. FLEMING: May I interrupt? I think the whole letter should go in the record. I did not hear the name of the person to whom it was addressed.

The WITNESS: The Honourable, The Secretary of State at Ottawa.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: I see no objection to that.

By Mr. Burton:

Q. May I enquire as to the municipal assessment? The municipal assessment was $1,250,000, and is it the custom of the municipalities in that part of the country to assess higher than the real value of the land?—A. That question has been raised before. It has been stated there is no uniformity of assessment throughout the B.C. area. Broadly speaking, I think the land is assessed at full value and improvements at some proportion, 50 or 60 per cent of the valuation; that has not been clearly established.

Q. It is your opinion that the valuations of these two different organizations were fairer valuations than the municipal assessment was?—A. I would not care to make any statement with regard to that in view of the appraiser's valuations. I mean to say, I would not consider myself a qualified appraiser by any manner of means.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: Would the committee not prefer to have the witness' statement completed before questions are put?

Mr. FLEMING: Agreed.

The WITNESS: The letter which I have read making the offer was accepted on June 23, 1943, by a letter written by the Secretary of State and signed by Norman A. McLarty. This letter was addressed to Gordon Murchison, the Director of the Veterans' Land Act at Ottawa. I do not think I need to read the letter. It is an acceptance of the offer outlined in the letter which I have just read.

Mr. FLEMING: Could we have the letter read? I think the letter should be put in the record and in order to follow the testimony being given at the moment, I think we should hear the letter read by the witness.

The WITNESS: The letter reads as follows:

Re: Japanese Evacuee Lands

> Dear Sir, Your offer to purchase seven hundred and sixty-nine (769) parcels of land for eight hundred and fifty thousand ($850,000) dollars, subject to the terms and conditions set forth in your Mr. Barnet's letter of May 17, as amended by your letter of May 29, is hereby accepted subject to the following conditions which I understand Mr. McPherson has discussed with you and with which you agree. These conditions are as follows:
>
> 1. All taxes, charges and fire insurance for the crop year of 1943 will be assumed by you.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-10-1-45-1-26
www.nikkeimuseum.org

2. All rents paid or payable for the crop year 1943 will be assigned to you less such adjustments as may be necessary to take care of any taxes, charges or fire insurance paid for the 1943 crop year.

3. All existing lease agreements covering the lands included in your offer will be assigned to you by a general assignment, you already having duplicate copies of all such leases.

I would appreciate receiving a letter from you confirming these variations in the conditions of your offer.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd) N. A. McLARTY,

Secretary of State.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: Would the committee prefer this letter be filed with the clerk?

Mr. FLEMING: It should be made part of the running record.

The WITNESS: At the last meeting I was asked to secure—before I say that, you will notice in the recommendation of the advisory committee a reference is made to the 17 valuations which they had made being in excess of the Soldier Settlement appraisal. I was asked at the last meeting to secure those spot valuations which numbered 17. Four of them were for properties in the municipality of Surrey; five in Maple Ridge; four in Mission; two in Pitt Meadows and two in Matsqui. I am not going to read the individual amounts, but I will read the totals. Unless you wish, I will not read those figures for the time being. You will notice that the total municipally assessed value on the 17 properties was $31,119.

Mr. FLEMING: I am sorry to be interrupting, but are we going to put this right in the record.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: I think it would be better, and if the committee has no objection it will be put right in the record.

SPOT VALUATIONS ON SEVENTEEN (17) PROPERTIES MADE BY MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE DURING THE MONTH OF MAY, 1943

Assessed Value	*Advisory Committee's Valuation*	*Soldier Settlement Board's Valuation*
$ 2,900.00	$ 5,400.00	$ 3,777.00
1,425.00	1,600.00	800.00
1,900.00	2,000.00	1,060.00
1,100.00	1,750.00	816.00
1,700.00	1,450.00	986.00
2,200.00	2,500.00	1,350.00
950.00	850.00	500.00
2,000.00	3,250.00	1,110.00
400.00		
3,500.00	4,400.00	3,610.00
3,729.00	4,000.00	2,085.00
1,400.00	1,750.00	1,100.00
1,050.00	950.00	988.00
1,000.00	950.00	1,222.00
1,100.00	1,100.00	727.00
1,200.00	3,500.00	2,723.00
2,700.00	3,550.00	3,278.00
2,865.00	4,150.00	2,100.00
$ 31,119.00	$ 43,100.00	$ 28,232.00

The WITNESS: The total municipal assessed valuations were $31,119. Now if you will just go to the last column you will see that the Soldiers' Settlement Board valuation was $28,232 on the 17 properties. The advisory committee's valuation on the same property was $43,100. The approximate acreage of those 17 properties which were purchased was about 140 acres.

Now then gentlemen, that is my statement in answer to the question raised at the last meeting regarding these spot valuations. Then, in addition to that I was asked to secure or to give you information in regard to the number of properties which were withdrawn from the original offer which figures show on this statement that I produce. Here again I have a number of sheets that perhaps would be of some use.

LIST OF PROPERTIES WITHDRAWN FROM THE V.L.A. OFFER AND SUBSEQUENTLY ADVERTISED AND SOLD.

	V. L. A.		Custodian		
No.	Appraisal	Offer	Appraisal	Sale Price	Date Sold
87	323.00	$ 317.00	$ 700.00	$ 750.00	July 1944
146	2,660.00	1,964.00	3,100.00	3,500.00	Jan. 1945
19	850.00	835.00	2,400.00	2,500.00	May 1945
120	1,300.00	1,276.00	2,750.00	2,750.00	Dec. 1945
480	453.00	445.00	1,000.00	1,500.00	June 1944
121	3,698.00	3,631.00	7,845.00	8,050.00	April 1944
78	1,600.00	1,571.00	2,850.00	2,850.00	June 1945
51	460.00	452.00	1,000.00	1,000.00	Aug. 1945
29	555.00	545.00	1,000.00	1,310.00	April 1946
23	1,875.00	1,841.00	1,850.00	2,500.00	June 1944
13	1,000.00	982.00	1,800.00	1,800.00	June 1946
375	25.00	25.00	250.00	325.00	Jan. 1945
148	521.00	512.00	950.00	1,030.00	April 1944
313	257.00	252.00	800.00	800.00	June 1944
390	—	—	400.00	400.00	June 1945
138	504.00	495.00	800.00	800.00	Oct. 1942
95	133.00	131.00	650.00	1,000.00	June 1944
129	507.00	498.00	550.00	980.00	June 1944
101	—	—	50.00	50.00	May 1945
37	336.00	330.00	1,600.00	1,620.00	Sept. 1945
347	1,088.00	1,068.00	3,250.00	3,250.00	June 1945
237	2,224.00	2,184.00	2,900.00	3,000.00	Sept. 1945
226	672.00	660.00	1,300.00	1,500.00	Jan. 1945
333	161.00	158.00	1,442.00	1,500.00	Sept. 1945
334	50.00	49.00	350.00	332.50	Mar. 1945
693	1,720.00	1,689.00	1,800.00	2,500.00	June 1946
668	447.00	439.00	1,000.00	1,050.00	Sept. 1944
445	683.00	671.00	1,375.00	2,110.00	June 1944
444	382.00	375.00	1,200.00	1,400.00	April 1946
438	3,750.00	3,682.00	4,235.00	4,000.00	July 1945
486	346.00	340.00	600.00	1,050.00	Nov. 1944
642	650.00	638.00	1,845.00	1,851.00	Fev. 1945
463	691.00	678.00	800.00	800.00	Dec. 1944
525	1,350.00	1,326.00	1,782.00	1,900.00	Aug. 1944
491	3,828.00	3,759.00	6,250.00	8,000.00	April 1946
491	1,006.00	988.00	1,750.00	2,750.00	April 1946
656	650.00	638.00	850.00	850.00	Oct. 1943
500	1,589.00	1,560.00	1,688.00	2,000.00	May 1945
23	875.00	859.00	4,375.00	4,650.00	Aug. 1944
748	—	—	350.00	350.00	Aug. 1944
502	1,032.00	1,013.00	1,825.00	1,825.00	Sept. 1944
43 props.	$39,591.00	$38,876.00	$73,312.00	$82,183.50	18 during 1944 18 before June 1945 6 after June 1945 6 during 1946

Now unless you wish I will not read these individual amounts but that is a list of properties withdrawn from the V.L.A. offer and subsequently advertised and sold. They were withdrawn for the reasons that I have already indicated. If you add them all up you may find that there are only 41 properties, but one property, the sixth one down, was divided into three. And for the purpose of reconciliation we use the total of 43 properties. The first column shows the Soldiers' Settlement Board appraisal under the order in council previously referred to. The second column is the N.L.A. offer which is something within two per cent of the appraisal. Then these properties being withdrawn, the custodian proceeded to deal with them in the same manner which he dealt with the other 900 parcels to which reference has been made in previous committees. Appraisals were made by the custodian and the total appraised valuation was $73,312. These parcels were advertised by the same method as

Source: Nikkei National Museum 20180161-145-1-37
www.nikkeimuseum.org

adopted in regard to the other properties and they were either advertised by the custodian or by the official administrator in co-operation with the custodian but they were all advertised and tenders called for. As a result of calling for tenders, offers were finally accepted, the total amount being $82,183.50.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Were those all sealed tenders?

The WITNESS: Yes, sealed tenders.

Mr. JOHNSTON: And they went to the highest bidder?

The WITNESS: Yes, to the highest bidder, providing it was equal to or more than the appraisal, and then it was accepted. The provision was, of course, made that no tender of necessity would be accepted. The practice was, however, to accept the highest tender providing that it was equal to or higher than the appraised valuation. That tender was usually accepted. You will find in one or two cases where the sale value was less. Can you see an item of $350 in the third column? Now that property was sold for $332.50. That was simply a case, where, in reviewing the tender, it was thought that it was close enough to warrant acceptance. I think that in the list you will only find one other case like that. Otherwise the accepted offer was either equal or in excess of the valuation. Now you might see, gentlemen, that on the list there are a number of cases where the appraisal and the sale price are identical. For example, you will see about the fifteenth item down in the third column where the appraisal was $800. The sale price was also $800. There is an appraisal of $400 and a sale price of $400. You might say, "Well, how would the tenderer know what the appraised value was?" He did not know and what happened in those cases was that a tender was received which was less than the amount of the appraisal and such offer was rejected. Then we went back to the person making the tender and said, "We will not sell it to you for that amount, but if you are prepared to pay such and such a price, and we named the appraised price, the matter will be given consideration". That is why, in a number of cases, the accepted tender actually equalled the appraisal. In many cases the offers were higher and they were immediately accepted.

Then, of course, I should like to point out that the offer from the Veterans' Land Act, received during 1943, was consumated on the basis of a sale as at January 1, 1943. These sales made by the custodian were not made in 1943. Eighteen of them were made in 1944, eleven made before June 1945, six after June 1945, and six during 1946. I mention that because I think it has already been established that there has been a continuous increase in real estate valuation. That, Mr. Chairman, I think is my statement in regard to the V.L.A. matters.

Now there was the question in regard to Karatsu's file.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Have you the assessed value on those 17 properties?

The WITNESS: I am afraid I have not. As far as the Vancouver office is concerned the assessments all appear in the files but we have not tabulated the assessments. We have been dealing with the properties on the appraised value rather than the assessed value.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Can you account for the tremendous difference between the appraisal of the V.L.A. and the custodian?

The WITNESS: No, beyond the fact there would be an increase because of advance in real estate values.

Mr. JOHNSTON: For instance, the first one on the list is over double the appraisal made by V.L.A.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Well, would the V.L.A. not take these properties over as farm lands and the custodian might take into consideration the fact that it

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-10-1-45-1-28
www.nikkeimuseum.org

The WITNESS: Yes, there are those factors. We assume the valuation made by the Soldiers' Settlement Board was in the light of the purpose for which they required the properties.

Mr. FLEMING: Let me just interrupt there. The witness says he assumes that fact. Now as a ground for that assumption is there something on the record from D.V.A. to that effect?

The WITNESS: The only thing is they thought those houses, for instance, would need several hundred dollars spent on them in order to make them habitable for the returned soldier whom they expected to place upon the property.

Mr. FLEMING: If that is the only statement on which this assumption is based I do not think it is a foundation at all. I think it would be well to avoid statements based on assumptions.

The WITNESS: Well I would be prepared to withdraw that. You have the fact that the Soldiers' Settlement Board appraisal was made under the order in council and you have had given to you the qualifications of that board. That was the basis on which this deal was made. When I came into the picture as director of the office having to sell these properties individually, I just followed the ordinary course, having them reappraised and calling for tenders and the results are shown.

Mr. GOLDING: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the witness can tell the committee at what stage the Veterans' Land Act made their appraisal and when the custodian made his.

The WITNESS: The order in council was dated the 29th of June, 1942. I have a copy of the order in council.

Mr. FLEMING: Will you put it on the record?

Mr. GOLDING: And then what time was the custodian's valuation made?

The WITNESS: The custodian's valuation was made from time to time as these properties became available for sale. The fact that 18 were sold in 1944 would indicate it was during 1944 that those 18 particular properties would be reappraised and it would be before the first half of 1945 that another 11 were appraised. That is to say when the custodian was in a position to deliver the title to these properties the appraisals were made.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: There was one piece of land had a hops kiln and hops were brought in from the various parts of the district to dry in this kiln. Obviously the Soldiers' Settlement Board would not be buying the land for that particular purpose. I think that you will find that is one reason for the difference in appraisal.

Mr. GOLDING: The situation would likely be that the property would have increased by this time, would it not?

The WITNESS: There was an increase in the value of real estate during the whole time.

Mr. GOLDING: From 1942.

The WITNESS: Well I would not care to make that statement, I do not think there was any increase in 1942 and not very much in 1943.

Mr. JOHNSTON: The valuation would not have increased 100 per cent. That would not account for the difference in valuation or appraisals made by the two different organizations.

Mr. GOLDING: I think you will find that property increased here 100 per cent between 1942 and 1945, and in many other towns.

Mr. FLEMING: I doubt if you will find that in the case of farming lands anywhere.

I think it would be better if we were to clear up our questions on this matter before Mr. Shears goes on to the next subject.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: I am in the hands of the committee. It might be done that way.

Agreed.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Mr. Shears, you introduced some correspondence this morning which had passed between the office of the Secretary of State and the Veterans' Land Act. Is there any other correspondence on record bearing on this sale of the Fraser Valley lands to the Veterans' Land Act administration?—A. The original offer from Mr. Murchison was for $750,000. Negotiations did take place between the two committees that I have referred to and they brought their offer up to $850,000. There was correspondence between the two departments but it was just relative to the increase in the offer.

Q. I think, Mr. Chairman, as part of the correspondence has been introduced, the full record should be laid before the committee and the balance of the correspondence produced.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: I do not see any great necessity of producing all those documents unless the honourable gentleman wishes to tell the committee what his reason for asking is.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. If any correspondence is relative to the matter and of interest to the committee, then surely it would be in the interests of the committee to know what the reasons were for the increase of the offer from $750,000 to $850,000 and the correspondence would be of some considerable value to us.—A. I can give the over-all reasons for that. The advisory committee said to this regional board which was set up that, "You are offering $750,000 and the Soldiers' Settlement Board appraisal is $862,000 and we will not accept the offer". Then later they came back and said after consideration that they would offer $850,000. The advisory committee then considered that the difference was so small, between $862,000 and the $850,000 that, taking into consideration the fact that it was for all the properties and not selected parcels, they should accept, and Judge Whiteside wrote the letter of acceptance.

Q. I take it the witness has not got the other correspondence so I will not delay proceedings or the questioning of the witness by asking for further correspondence. I will, however, offer a motion to that effect in due course. Now coming to the second of the statements submitted this morning. The spot valuations of the 17 properties made by the advisory committee were made during the month of May 1943. Now those valuations I take it were made at the date of receipt of the offer of $850,000?—A. Yes.

Q. Up to that time the advisory committee had rejected the offer of $750,000 without waiting to make these spot valuations?—A. That is correct, yes.

Q. And when the offer was increased by the V.L.A. to $850,000 the advisory committee arranged to have these spot valuations made. You outlined in your evidence at the last meeting why that was done. I see of the 17 properties the offer in the case of 15 is higher than the appraisal and lower in only two cases. Those two are small properties, and they are the 12th and 13th propertes on the list. In one case the advisory committee valuation is $950 and the Soldiers' Settlement Board $988. The second case shows $950 for the advisory committee and $1,222 by the Soldiers' Settlement Board. In the other cases the advisory committee valuation is higher than the Soldiers' Settlement Board valuation, [illegible]

Q. In all of the other 15 cases the advisory committee valuation is higher than the Soldiers' Settlement Board valuation, in some cases it is twice as much. Then, in the last statement submitted by the witness we have an appraisal made by the custodian. Now, were those appraisals of the 43 properties made at the same time or were they made from time to time as offers for the properties were received?—A. They were not all made at one time and they were not made until such time as we had cleared the question of title and were able to offer these properties for sale. For example, here is a deceased estate and we were not in a position to offer that property until the administrator, through his legal processes, said, "I am prepared at this time to offer this particular property for sale," and in connection with that an advertisement was placed in the newspapers calling for tenders on that particular property, and that started to take place during 1944.

Q. I understand that in relating the date of the appraisal to the date of the sale— —A. The date of the appraisal would be approximately the time of the sale.

Q. It would be approximately the time of the sale. Then when we are comparing the columns of appraisal by the custodian and the sales price by the custodian we are comparing appraisals and sales made at the same time?—A. Relatively at the same time.

Q. And the sale price of those 43 properties when sold by the custodian were running substantially in excess of the custodian's appraisal; even then your aggregate is advanced by $9,000 on an aggregate appraisal of $73,000?—A. That is correct.

Q. In other words, the sale was running roughly 12 per cent above the custodian's appraisal made at the same time?—A. That would be correct; and, of course, that would result from the fact they were offered for tender and the person placing offers made their own bid.

Q. I do not know whether it would be accounted for as simply as that, but that is the fact. Turning back to the V.L.A. appraisal, the appraisal in that case—you have indicated it was made some time between June, 1942, and May, 1943, between the date of the order in council and the date of the first offer?—A. Yes.

Q. When was the custodian's office in Vancouver made aware of the amounts of the appraisals of the V.L.A. administration?—A. At the time the offer was made. That would be the letter I have read from Mr. Murchison.

Q. That would be in May, 1943?—A. That would be in May, 1943.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Offered by the custodian?

Mr. FLEMING: No, by the Veterans' Land Act for a group of properties involved.

Mr. JOHNSTON: How does it come that the V.L.A. made an appraisal until such time as the custodian was in a position to offer a bill of sale?

Mr. FLEMING: However it may be, the fact is that that appraisal made by the Veterans' Land Act was not communicated to the custodian's office in Vancouver until the time the first offer was submitted in May 1943?

The WITNESS: That is correct.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. I do not know whether there is any further comment required apart from the fact that the custodian's appraisal, various appraisals, total almost twice the figure of appraisals made by the Veterans' Land Act, and on that an advance of probably 12 per cent is made in all the custodian's sales. Now, in the light of that experience, Mr. Shears, do you think there is any advantage to the custodian in selling the whole area en bloc, or would the custodian have been able to obtain higher prices in the aggregate if he had been allowed to sell

Source: Nikkei National Museum 2018-16-1-45-1-29
www.nikkeimuseum.org

individual parcels? I wonder if there is any great value—any great importance to be attached to the selling en bloc as a consideration to be taken into account in dealing with the offer of the Veterans' Land Act administration?—A. I would assume that this might have happened, that there might have been certain parcels that would have been left on our hands, and as has been previously indicated of the total acreage of these properties only a fraction was usually developed and cultivated; but by and large I think if the properties had been offered individually those that were sold would possibly have realized higher prices but the custodian might have certain properties unsold.

Q. I think we will all agree that other things being equal there is less cost to the vendor if he can sell the whole group en bloc rather than sell individually, but I think you will agree, Mr. Shears, that in the light of subsequent experience better results are obtained when the sales were made in individual parcels. In your last statement of the 43 properties, 41 were sold at prices in advance of the custodian's appraisal and all of them at prices very substantially in advance of the Veterans' Land Act appraisal.—A. Yes, that is true. The only thing is that the V.L.A. offer was on the basis of an offer made in 1943. These properties were sold in 1944 and the early part of 1945.

Q. Yes, I think we are bearing that in mind. That is why I point out the relevance of the date of the appraisal made by the custodian himself, and that was a very substantial advance. Now, what was your experience, your comparable experience with the sale of other properties elsewhere in British Columbia? I am not speaking now of the urban properties sold in Vancouver; but you had experience with other rural properties, farm properties. How did your experience there with advancing prices, say in 1944, 1945 and 1946, compare with the statement you have just given as to the advances in values in the Fraser Valley area in that period?

Mr. GLADSTONE: Does your statement preceding that mean that in your opinion the lands ought not to be sold until later—

Mr. FLEMING: No, I have not expressed any opinion; I am getting information. I want to establish the weight to be attached to some of these factors that the witness has set up to explain the very great discrepancy in the third statement we got this morning.

Mr. GLADSTONE: I got the inference that you think they ought not to have been sold until later.

Mr. FLEMING: No, I did not say that. You will hear my conclusions when I have heard all the evidence.

The WITNESS: The other properties, sir, were offered for sale—the first offer was the 19th of June, 1943, and the second group of lands was offered the 1st of September, 1943, and the third group on the 30th of March, 1944. That is the list. And the custodian made appraisals just prior to those dates covering the properties that he was offering for sale. There were after that date in 1945 considerable increases in real estate values which continued up until the end of 1946.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Now, you have indicated that in the case of each of these sales in other areas, rural properties, the valuation by the custodian's office was made at the time of sale.—A. Approximately at the time of sale.

Q. You have not got earlier valuations to compare that would indicate any trend in prices according to the custodian's book valuations?—A. No, I have not. The appraisal was made prior to the properties being offered for sale.

Q. Did you get any information from competent persons in British Columbia as to advancing prices in those years?—A. I think it can be stated that those sales—it is an accepted fact that real estate prices continued to advance and have advanced very much as the years progressed.

Q. We were trying to get at the rate. Someone in the committee said this morning something about 100 per cent. I think it will be news to a great many that the valuation of farm properties advanced 100 per cent. You would not go that far?—A. Oh, no.

Q. In the period 1943 to 1945—1945-46 there was not any advance like 100 per cent in the value of farm properties.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: What date?

Mr. FLEMING: 1944, 1945 and 1946. The order in council was made in June, 1942. The valuation made by the Veterans' Land Act administration was made sometime between that and May, 1943—we do not know exactly when that period was. I supposé it is fair to say it may have been made in the spring of 1943.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: The difference between the value under the Veterans' Land Act and the present date of 1945?

Mr. FLEMING: We are trying to get a basis of comparison with the values that were obtained on sale of these properties in 1943. Eighteen were sold in 1944; seventeen in 1945 and just six in 1946. Now, we are trying to get the basis of comparison of the valuation made by V.L.A. in the spring of 1943 with the prices obtained in those sales in about half of 1944 and about half in 1945.

The WITNESS: I am prepared to say that I do not think there was an increase of 100 per cent from the time of 1943 to 1944.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. And 1945?—A. I would still not think it would be 100 per cent. There were some properties, of course, that I believe might have been sold in 1946 where the seller was able to obtain 100 per cent more than had he sold that property in 1942.

Q. There will always be individual cases, but we are dealing with generalities.—A. All I can say is that the trend was upward from 1943 up to the end of 1946. The trend was gradual in 1943 and 1944 and became more accentuated in 1945 and 1946.

Q. Having regard to the fact that the Veterans' Land Act appraisal was made presumably in the spring of 1943 or thereabouts, and about half of these properties were actually sold in 1944 and about half in 1945, is it your opinion that advancing real estate prices in general do not account for an advance of more than 100 per cent between the Veterans' Land Act appraisal and the prices obtained on sale of these properties?—A. I do not think it can all be accounted for by 100 per cent rise in valuations during that period.

By Mr. Cruickshank:

Q. How many of those properties were sold by the custodian as farms?—A. They were all farm lands—

Q. I do not agree with that. The list of properties, these 43 properties—
—A. I cannot tell without looking at the files, but definitely 70 or 80 per cent will be farm lands. There will be some that were not, but they were all farm lands in the Fraser Valley area—village and farm lands.

Q. Why were they withdrawn from sale?—A. They were withdrawn—

Q. I have that list— —A. —because at the time of the offer the custodian was not able to give title to those particular properties due to title difficulties.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-30
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I want to get this straight. With due deference to Mr. Fleming, I cannot follow his line of argument in connection with farm lands in the Fraser Valley.

Mr. FLEMING: I did not have any line of argument.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I do not think those were all withdrawn for farm lands. I mentioned a gas station in Mission City. If you could give me a commission, I could sell one for $15,000 because the gas companies are going around buying these properties.

The WITNESS: That particular property is not on this list.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: But I presume there are properties such as that. I do know of one property on this list which was sold at Hancy to a garage concern. This firm was in a better position to pay a good price than a person would be buying it as farm land.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Which property was that?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I could not give you the number.

Mr. JOHNSTON: You said it was on this list.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: It was withdrawn by the custodian and was certainly not sold by the custodian as farm land. You cannot arrive at farm values by taking into consideration those lands which were withdrawn and were not sold for farm purposes.

By Mr. Jacnicke:

Q. I should like to refer to this first document filed. The statement shows 23 parcels withdrawn as having been previously sold by the Japanese?—A. Twenty-six, I think.

Q. Twenty-three on my list.—A. It should be 26 and 43.

Q. They were sold by the Japanese. The Japanese made the deals direct with the purchasers without the intervention of the custodian?—A. I am glad you brought up that point. Kindly have this in mind; the offer included those 26 parcels and, in the land registry office, those properties were still in the name of the Japanese. These Japanese, not recently, probably several years previously, had made agreements for sale.

Q. When were those properties sold?—A. The Japanese had either completed the sale themselves or had already negotiated the sale and therefore, we were not in a position to convey.

Q. Now, the last item, $23,258 which appears under the heading "V.L.A. offer accepted," that offer was not accepted?—A. It was under that heading but it was not accepted.

Q. Was that the amount which the Japanese received?—A. No, that was the amount which the V.L.A. offered for those 26 parcels.

Q. Did you find out what the price was for those 26 parcels when you found they had been sold?—A. No, we had no reason to make any enquiries. They were not vested in the custodian. They had already been sold.

Q. The purchase price had already been paid in full?—A. It had either been paid in full, or, if it had not been the custodian was only interested in collecting the balance.

Q. In connection with how many of those properties were there any balances left?—A. I would not care to say.

Q. You would not know the price of the farm, the price at which the Japanese sold?—A. I would say our files might indicate, in a few cases, the deal the Japanese had made, but, gentlemen, you may appreciate my position out there. We had no interest in these properties at all. We had no reason to enquire.

Q. Except as to this, whether there was still a balance unpaid?—A. We just accepted the statement of the Japanese who said such and such a person owed a balance of $500. We collected it, the same as we collected other accounts.

Q. On page 57 of your report, you have an item of income $503,397.35?—A. What page is that?

Q. Page 57.—A. Yes, I see that.

Q. I presume that represents rentals?—A. The fourth item from the end, real estate income, is rentals.

Q. That is the one I mean.—A. Yes.

Q. Does that include rentals from urban and rural property?—A. That is the total rental, rural and urban.

Q. Could we have a breakdown of that?—A. I cannot give it to you here.

Q. What period does that cover?—A. It covers the period from the date of the evacuation up until the time the properties were sold.

Q. That is approximately 1942-1943?—A. And 1944.

Q. What would be the average period, a year's rental or two years' rental?—A. In realing with 2,000-odd parcels, I would not care to say what the average would be. It would vary. Some properties may have been sold in the middle of 1943, others were not sold until perhaps 1945.

Q. I realize that, but I thought you might be able to give an opinion as to the average.—A. I think if I give an opinion as to the average time, it might or might not be right and I would prefer not to make a statement.

Q. Could you give us a breakdown of the figure, $503,000? Could you get it?—A. By going through the 2,500 files we could give it to you.

Q. I did not mean that.—A. That would be the only possible way to do it. We have the total revenues from all our properties, $503,000, but a breakdown could be given to you. It is just a matter of bookkeeping and accounting; it could be done.

Q. Would you not keep the urban and rural properties separate in your books?—A. No.

By Mr. Boucher:

Q. Bearing in mind the valuations of the farm properties as given by the VLA were much below the assessed values of them, bearing in mind also that on the properties which were withdrawn from sale to the VLA, a considerable increase in price over those valuations was had, and bearing in mind that you had some means of ascertaining the prices received by the Japanese who, themselves, sold their properties, was any attempt made at the time to obtain independent valuators to give a more satisfactory valuation or appraisal of the property? I say that by virtue of some experience the government had in buying airports when the government relied very substantially on valuators from the Canadian National Railways or the Canadian Pacific Railway who had experience in valuing land of this kind. I say that, also, in view of the fact that the facts revealed to us would indicate or might indicate to some, at least, there was a difficulty in getting a proper appraisal of this land and that the circumstances revealed to the custodian would indicate or might indicate the valuations he had received or appraisals he had received were not such as could be relied upon. My question is, therefore, was there not sufficient evidence in the custodian's hands to require him to ask for a better appraisal before selling even to the VLA? What attempt was made to get that better appraisal?—A. At the time of the offer there was no information in the hands of the custodian relative to prices. As I have previously indicated, the advisory committee considered the matter and it was their opinion that the valuation on which they were basing their negotiations was a sound one. It had been made by qualified appraisers of the Soldier Settlement Board of Canada who had been actively

I DID THE JPZ NOT RECEIVE RENT ON THEIR PROPERTIES IN THE CARE OF THE CUSTODIAN? I PLAN [illegible] SUGGEST YES TO SALE

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-31
www.nikkeimuseum.org

engaged in valuing land for government purposes for a considerable number of years. The committee accepted that appraisal as a sound basis upon which to carry on negotiations. The only indication of any change was in the 17 spot valuations which were made and I have read Judge Whiteside's letter in which he referred to that.

Q. You think the fact that the valuation was very substantially below the assessment valuation and that the valuation was very substantially below the prices received for properties withdrawn from the VLA was not sufficient to have you enquire into the prices received by the Japanese who sold their own property?

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. Could the witness tell us when the offer was received from the Soldier Settlement appraisal—

By Mr. Boucher:

Q. I do not think the witness answered my question. Do you think those facts were not sufficient to cast any doubt on the efficiency of the VLA valuation?—A. I can only repeat that the negotiations for these deals took place between the regional committee of the VLA and the advisory committee for the custodian. I have indicated all the facts which were placed before those committees and the correspondence which took place as well as the recommendation of the advisory committee and the acceptance of the offer by the Department of the Secretary of State. Those are all the relative facts I can give to you.

Q. That does not answer my question. Should not those relative facts, in your opinion, have cast some suspicion upon the efficiency of the valuation?—A. The only possibility would be in regard to the 17 spot valuations. At that time, the custodian had no information at all in regard to the values, or whether the Soldier Settlement valuation was correct. He had no possibility of knowing whether that was a fact or not.

By Mr. Golding:

Q. As a matter of fact, if you had sold those properties for a much higher price, the soldiers and returned men would, of necessity, have had to pay more for their property when they bought it?—A. I am sorry, I did not hear that.

Q. If you had sold those properties for a much higher price than the V.L.A. put on them, then, in turn, the returned men purchasing those properties would have to pay much more for them?—A. That, of course, would be a matter outside of my department, but I think that would likely be true. So far as these particular deals are concerned, gentlemen, I think it has been stated, but I must repeat it, these particular deals were negotiated on behalf of the custodian by the advisory committee under Judge Whiteside and the regional committee of the V.L.A. The consideration of it and the recommendation for its acceptance was entirely in the hands of the advisory committee.

By Mr. Burton:

Q. Would your department know, in connection with those 43 parcels which were sold, how many ex-service men bought those properties?—A. We have no information regarding that at all.

Q. In connection with the sales, while you have mentioned before that the highest offer was accepted, you had no ruling or regulation that, all other things being equal, the returned men would get the preference?—A. If, by any chance, [illegible] on a returned man, I think,

undoubtedly, the returned man would have been given the preference. At the time those properties were sold, by and large, we did not have offers from returned men. It was the general public who bid for them.

Q. You do not know whether there were any returned men who took advantage of the sale of the 43 properties?—A. I am not positive; I would say no.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. There was no regulation giving veterans a priority in such cases?—A. No.

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. I should like to make enquiry in connection with 768 parcels for which an offer was received in May of 1943. For the most of May, 1943, there was a Japanese representative on the advisory committee? Did Mr. Yamaga resign because of this offer, or did he have any comment to make on that offer?—A. Mr. Yamaga was not at the meeting when the offer was finally considered and the advisory committee made its recommendation. He had resigned previous to that.

Q. Was he at the meetings when this matter was under consideration?—A. Oh yes, decidedly. He was at the meeting when the first offer was received and he was agreeable, in principle, to the sale of these lands. Mr. Yamaga farmed in that area for 35 years. He told the committee friends of his had written indicating that they thought deterioration would be taking place in regard to their farms. Mr. Yamaga told the committee he was convinced by and large, the best interests of the Japanese would be served by the liquidation of these properties.

The policy of liquidation was agreed upon by all the members of the committee. The only thing about which Mr. Yamaga hesitated was, I think his expression was, "I hope that adequate prices will be obtained." The answer to that was that adequate prices would be obtained because the valuation of the Soldier Settlement Board which was considered as sound, and would be the basis of the negotiations.

Q. Did Mr. Yamaga believe adequate and proper prices were paid?—A. As I have said, he was not there when the final deal was made.

Q. He merely approved of the principle of selling these properties?—A. He approved of the principle of selling the properties.

Q. He had no opportunity of approving the prices?—A. He had resigned before the deal was consummated.

Q. Had he anything to say at any time about the appraisal?—A. I do not think he did. I can say he was quite agreeable to the principle but did not have anything, so far as I recollect to say in regard to the actual deal.

Q. Were minutes of the meetings kept?—A. Yes.

Q. Could those be produced, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIRMAN: I am entirely in the hands of the committee. If the committee thinks it would be of any advantage to have those minutes, it is for the committee to say. I do not see the necessity for producing the minutes because the witness has said the gentleman was not present when the deal was consummated.

Mr. STEWART: There might be something of importance contained in those minutes had Mr. Yamaga, at any time, signified his approval of the valuation which was offered.

Mr. FLEMING: I would support Mr. Stewart in that connection. After all, we have been told about some of the things which were done by that committee in the course of its deliberations, and we have had some of the correspondence

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-32
www.nikkeimuseum.org

which had a place in the eventual consummation of the agreement. Now, it seems to me the committee is entitled to the production of all the correspondence and entitled to the production of all the minutes. Nothing may come of it. After we have perused these documents we may be satisfied there is nothing which requires further questioning. However, I would strongly urge the committee is entitled to the production of all those records.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: I am entirely in the hands of the committee on the matter. If the committee thinks such documents should be made available to it, it is for the committee to say.

Mr. STEWART: I would move that such minutes be filed.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: In that case, I ask the witness to be good enough to bring those documents here for the committee.

The WITNESS: If that is your wish, I will have to send to Vancouver for them. I have not copies here.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: Does the honourable gentleman insist that the witness produce these documents himself, or that such documents be filed by some official of the department?

Mr. STEWART: All I ask is that they be made available to the committee as rapidly as possible.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: It is agreed, then, that the witness will secure these documents and will have them produced for the committee.

Mr. FLEMING: It might be a proper occasion to put forward a motion that the balance of the correspondence relating to the sale of the Fraser Valley farm lands to the Veterans' Land Act administration be also produced. I ask that it be made available to the committee. If there is nothing contained in it which requires to be brought before the committee, then we need not take up the time of the committee with it, but, for my part, I would be willing to facilitate the despatch of the committee's business by looking these documents over if they are made available. If there is no particular relevance in them, then I certainly will not trouble the committee or take up its time with them.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: Would you prepare a motion to that effect?

Mr. FLEMING: I have just made it a motion that the balance of the correspondence relating to the sale of the Fraser Valley lands to the Veterans' Land Act administration be made available to the committee.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: You should have the words "Fraser Valley Japanese land" in that motion.

Mr. FLEMING: That is all we have been speaking about.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Make it Japanese land. I do not think it is any business of any Toronto member at the next campaign to discuss what was sold privately. This is only Japanese land.

Mr. FLEMING: Obviously, Mr. Chairman, the motion has reference to any lands which were the subject of correspondence between the custodian's office or the advisory committee and the Veterans' Land Act administration. Now, they started, if I remember correctly, corresponding about 768 parcels. The sale which was consummated embraced 741 parcels, so we want the correspondence bearing on all these properties.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I am not objecting to that, but there may have been some other lands purchased by the Soldier Settlement, I do not know whether there was or not, in the Fraser Valley. It is not the business of this committee to consider such purchases.

Mr. FLEMING: We are dealing with those which were under the administration of the custodian of enemy property.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Fleming has referred to those which were sold through the custodian.

Mr. FLEMING: To all those which were vested in the custodian of enemy property.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Of enemy property?

Mr. FLEMING: Yes.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: Does the committee agree to the motion?

Agreed.

Mr. STEWART: Will that motion be wide enough to include not only the advisory committee on rural properties, but also the advisory committee on the greater Vancouver properties?

The WITNESS: The advisory committee on greater Vancouver properties would have no bearing on this particular deal. They had no negotiations. Judge Whiteside's committee was purely a rural committee.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: The committee has agreed to the motion. Are there any other questions?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I am not trying to stick up for the Fraser Valley at all, but if you are going to take in any part, why not take in Vancouver and all the area. There are farms in Victoria, for instance. There are some would-be lawyers with property in the city of Vancouver, and I want to know how they came off in dealing with that property.

Mr. FLEMING: I do not know whether Mr. Cruickshank is asking me why I did not make the scope of the motion broader, but the reason is we have been dealing, in the questions this morning, with the sale of Fraser Valley properties. We have not, yet, come to the sale of the other properties. I assume, if the records which are made available to the committee at that time are not complete, we shall ask for the balance of the records in connection with these properties.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: You must expect us to be here until September or October.

Mr. FLEMING: I hope I am not here then. It is quite open to any member of the committee to enlarge the motion.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: If Mr. Cruickshank cares to move that the other correspondence in connection with the greater Vancouver area be produced, I have no objection at all.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I was trying to speed matters up. We will receive this correspondence in about a week, then the week after that if we are to send to Vancouver for another batch of correspondence, it will drag our work out. I was just trying to get it all at once.

Mr. FLEMING: Could we not get it by air mail? We do not have to wait a week.

The WITNESS: We could have the minutes sent by air mail. If you are going to make any suggestion with regard to the minutes of the committee for the greater Vancouver properties, I do not think I am in a position to assure you anything can be sent. The set-up of the committees was quite different. In the case of the committee on rural properties, I was asked by Judge Whiteside, always to be present at their meetings. I was always there. The minutes of these meetings were written up. In regard to the meetings of the greater Vancouver committee, I was only there on a few occasions when I was specially asked to be present. I submitted the offers as they were received and all the available information, such as appraisals, offers and rentals and received from that committee, through its secretary, either their acceptance or otherwise. I do not know what records you could obtain from that particular advisory committee.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-33
www.nikkeimuseum.org

I have not their minutes. I do have a copy of the minutes of the rural advisory committee, as I have said. Very definitely those minutes or those records of the greater Vancouver committee would have no bearing at all on this matter with which you are now dealing.

Mr. FLEMING: There is, perhaps, one other point which ought to be cleared up as a result of Mr. Cruickshank's observation. Was there, Mr. Shears, any correspondence with the Veterans' Land Act or with the department of the Secretary of State concerning sales of these other rural properties or the Vancouver property? As I understand it, there was not any correspondence dealing substantially with those sales.

The WITNESS: None at all.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. After all, the only correspondence to which the Veterans' Land Act was a party or the Secretary of State was a party, was in connection with the sale of the 741 properties to the Veterans' Land Act?—A. Yes. I was asked a question once before as to how many properties were not in the Fraser Valley and I said 20 or 30. I think the exact number is 30 and they were on Vancouver Island or the Gulf Islands. So, in this connection, there were 710 in the Fraser Valley and 30 or 31 were possibly in other areas.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: Is that all, gentlemen?

Mr. FLEMING: Yes, on that point.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: The motion was made and carried that the correspondence exchanged in connection with the sale of the 741 properties by the custodian would be made available. So far as the rest is concerned, the other properties, if there is no other correspondence of interest to the committee, I see no necessity for insisting on that point.

Mr. FLEMING: The correspondence with the committee will include the 31 properties on Vancouver Island, they were not differentiated, but we were dealing with the properties which were the subject of the offers from the Veterans' Land Act, the most of which were in the Fraser Valley but some on Vancouver Island.

The witness had another statement he wished to make on another matter, did he not?

The Acting CHAIRMAN: The witness has a statement to make on another matter relating to his previous testimony at the last sitting of the committee. I shall ask him to make that statement now, if he so desires.

The WITNESS: This is in connection with Naoichi Karatsu, custodian's file 8666. I was asked to secure some information regarding this person. I have prepared a statement, but I should like to say this first.

At the last committee meeting, in answer to a question, I said this:

> I would say this, too, it will be without doubt possible for you to introduce some cases along the line of that which has now been indicated, but there will be thousands where you will not find the same situation.

I have read in the Toronto *Globe*, that I said,

> There are thousands of cases where you will find this is the situation.

This is so directly opposite to what I said, that I just wanted to make that fact plain and I will be happy to see some correction made in the newspaper regarding this matter. This article says,

> Mr. Shears admitted this was quite a typical case but added there are thousands of cases where you will find this is the situation.

As I quoted my evidence I said,

> It will be, without doubt, possible for you to introduce some cases along the line of that which has now been indicated, but there will be thousands where you will not find the same situation.

I just wanted to make that correction.

Then, in connection with this particular matter, Karatsu left his property—rather, he registered his property with the custodian on the 8th day of May, 1942. In connection with the registration he made a statement of his personal property which was as follows:—

> Chesterfield, chairs, carpenter's tools, kitchen utensils, two beds, farm tools and implements, one bureau, gramophone, galvanized chain, flower covering, fishing gear and coil of ½ inch cotton rope.

This was his declaration on the 8th of May, 1942. It is evident Karatsu was not evacuated until some months later. He was at Hastings Park in Vancouver on the 8th day of September, 1942, and, just about that time he was being moved away and he made an additional registration which reads as follows: There are 23 items.

3 mahogany planks
1 boat box of supplies
1 large box of school supplies
14 pieces of glass
A package of school books
3 steel bed springs
1 chesterfield chair
2 mattresses
1 willow patterned platter
3 boxes of Mason jars and caps
1 basket of kitchen utensils
2 packages of paste
Gramophone and records
2 double beds, iron
A rice bowl
1 5-gallon crock
4 kitchen chairs
1 stool
2 pieces linoleum
2 rubber mats
1 office file
1 bed spring
1 iron kettle.

That is what I would like you to have in mind just for the moment. At that time his place was under lease by an arrangement made as of the 1st of May, 1942, for the following nine months to a Mr. Bernard Ryan. Mr. Bernard Ryan together with Mr. Karatsu signed a document which reads: This affidavit made in duplicate is a certified agreement between both parties that inclusive with the farm lands the lessee shall have the use of the miscellaneous farm tools and household effects until the termination of the lease. The twenty-three items are listed down and the document is signed by Mr. Bernard Ryan and Mr. Karatsu. That was on September 8, 1942. Then on September 12, 1942, Mr. Karatsu was vacuated to Sanden. During September of 1942 this particular property became vacant and it remained vacant until March, 1943, a period of about seven months. Shortly after it became vacant, on October 28, our field men went to this particular farmhouse and inventoried what was found there.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-34
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Everything which appeared on Mr. Karatsu's list at that time, October 28, 1942, was there. I wonder if that list which was presented to me at the last meeting is here and could I see it?

Everything on Karatsu's list was there plus a large number of other items which had not been mentioned at all in the file up to that time. There were thirty or forty additional articles. A copy of a list containing those was mailed to Mr. Karatsu at Sanden and he was asked if this was a complete list and he sent it back, signed as being correct. There is nothing in our files or any suggestion there of anything over the twenty-three items which Karatsu listed himself until the additional items were added by our field men. The statement was made at the last meeting that the Japanese considered that the articles were worth $700 odd and as I pointed out then this was the owner's valuation which he supplied as a value for these items. It is a fact that on March 4, 1947, Karatsu complained about the sale and he thought then the articles might be worth approximately $500. As I say, after October 28, this property remained vacant until March, 1942. The property was boarded up. It was in an isolated position at the end of the 19th road and our file indicates that it was an easy mark for vandalism. I would say that my field staff showed great zeal when the inventory took place, because they certainly went the limit. They had added thirty items which, when our own men came to have them auctioned, were found to be of no value and they were abandoned. Those items were:—

1 poor umbrella
4 shallow empty boxes
3 sheets brass wire
10 bundles books
1 pair gum boots
3 lengths stove pipe
1 gas lamp shade
4 posts 2 x 2 6' long
1 lamp base (cracked)
1 box old clothes
4 hats
1 candy pail
5 pounds grease paper
1 chest drawers (no drawers)
2 small home-made tables
2 wooden bowls
1 home-made bed
1 sea shell ash tray
1 small piece kitchen linoleum
Japanese decorations on wall
Magazines by tons
5 window blinds
2 pails
1 lid for 5-gallon crock
1 bag brass wire
4 Japanese calendar pictures
1 food cupboard.

Now our field men listed all those things and it made an imposing list of thirty extra items but they were items which, at a later date, were just abandoned by our own men when they came to move them for auction. There are also

goods which are unaccounted for most of which were not on the original list of twenty-three but were on the list which our own field men made. These items were unaccounted for:

3 mahogany planks
1 box school supplies
2 boxes glass
1 parcel-dragon kite
1 willow pattern platter
3 boxes mason jars
2 double bedsteads (iron)
1 five gal. crock
1 piano stool
4 chairs
2 rubber mats
1 office file
1 iron kettle
1 box boat supplies
Ship's compass
Water pump
Steering wheel
Fog horn
Tin shears
Small vise
Fishing tackle
Pipe fittings
Brass odds and ends
Nuts and bolts
1 gas iron (with fish line)
1 box loose books
4 bundles lumber
1 roast tin
10 cups
4 bowls
3 salers
2 Japanese flash lights
3 small Xmas decorations
1 eight foot belt
1 large funnel
1 crock bowl
2 bake pans
1 canvas life preserver
1 large hammer
3 deep sea fishing lures
1 sad iron
4 pictures
1 gal. candy jar
1 Japanese tub full miscellaneous articles
1 metal box
1 wedge.

The point is this. Of a total of about eighty items, only fifteen were actually sold. Three items were shipped; thirty were abandoned, and we have lost track of those others, the last group that I have read.

Now gentlemen, I am not a valuator and have not looked at Karatsus valuations set opposite that list but from the items which I have read I would doubt very much at this time, whether, by any conceivable stretch of the

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-35
www.nikkeimuseum.org

imagination you could make such goods value up to $700 or even $500. One item which I think might have some value is that contained in the box of boat supplies. The ship's compass, however, is one of that little type which they use in their fishing boats and which can be bought for $3 or $4 or $5. In addition there was the water pump, steering wheel, fog horn, tin shears, small vise, fishing tackle, pipe fittings, brass odds and ends, nuts and bolts. On the face of it, those are the items and there is the story. The Japanese declared twenty-three items of which fifteen have been sold and the others have not been accounted for. The list is largely made up of numerous small items which our own field men have listed. There is a list of those abandoned and others were taken by vandals before the property was again rented in March, 1943. I think that is perhaps all that I wish to state in respect of this matter.

Mr. JAENICKE: Mr. Chairman, after hearing Mr. Shears and his explanation of the matter I may say that, as I indicated at the last hearing when I presented the case, Mr. Shears had already told us there was vandalism and theft and things of that nature going on and I fully appreciate the difficulties which he and his men had. He has given us the particulars as to what Mr. Karatsu had when the articles were listed and then they were later listed and I presume the list I produced was the list that was made by an official of your office. As I said at the last meeting I think the members ought to be able to judge for themselves. I move that this list and the latter statements be printed in the proceedings so that the members may form their own conclusions, keeping in mind the explanations made by Mr. Shears.

Agreed.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: Well, gentlemen, if there are no other questions of the witness could we discuss the adjournment?

Mr. FLEMING: I have a number of questions on other matters arising out of this original testimony.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: Well, will you go ahead now.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Mr. Shears, did the custodian have some responsibility for these assets from the very beginning? You referred at the outset of your testimony to the first order in council, No. 9590, dated December 7, 1941, vesting property of Japanese occupying or holding territory, in the custodian.—A. What number?

Q. The first was 9590; and then we go down to order in council No. 469, of January 1942, that was the one that established the protected area in British Columbia; and then in February 1942 there is the government notice requiring enemy aliens to leave the protected area; and then comes order in council 1665 of March 4, 1942 establishing the British Columbia Securities Commission with power to remove Japanese. There are subsequent orders; the registration of Japanese on March 13, 1942 by order in council 2483, and March 27, 1942 number 5523 and so on. Now, has there been at any time any administration in Canada of property in Canada of persons of the Japanese race by anyone apart from the custodian? Has there been any other administration of their property?—A. As far as evacuees were concerned nothing was vested or came into our hands before P.C. 1665 which was amended by P.C. 2483, and with regard to liquidation, by order in Council 469. With regard to evacuees' property, this became vested in the custodian, if the Japanese registered his property with the custodian before he was evacuated, or it was automatically vested upon his evacuation. The only Japanese properties which the custodian dealt with prior to P.C. 1665 was the property of Enemy Japanese.

Q. Now I take it that there is no other government official or government department or government body that was responsible for administration until the evacuation of enemy property took over under these orders in council.

Doctor COLEMAN: May I have your permission to answer Mr. Chairman? I think I can answer a little better than Mr. Shears. He was not in the office at that time. I think you will find if you will look up the record that early in February, if not before, early in 1942, I issued certain orders affecting people of the Japanese race requiring them to turn in radios, motor cars, and I recollect they were supposed to be turned over to the police officers. I, myself, after the policy of evacuation was announced in February, the latter part of February, after consulting Mr. McLarty, then the custodian, proceeded to Vancouver very early in the month of March 1942. I would have to look up my diary but I am sure I arrived there on the 9th of March and that was just four days before registration began. Now at that time there were certain preliminary security measures taken requiring the people of the Japanese race living in the coastal areas to turn into the R.C.M.P., or persons designated by them, certain equipment which was regarded as dangerous if left in their hands. The articles I remember particularly are radios, cameras, firearms, and motor cars. With those, the custodian, as such, had nothing to do. I also discovered when I reached Vancouver in 1942, early in March 1942, that it was reported, and I could only go by what I was told by people there, that there were a number of persons of the Japanese race who had been anticipating the order of evacuation and had, in many cases, disposed of their chattels. Some of those chattels were probably disposed of at a very improvident price. One of the purposes or one of the reasons for getting them to register, in addition to the danger lying in their retention of the chattels, was to afford a certain measure of protection to them. I arrived in Vancouver realizing there was a large number of very small and petty businesses conducted by the Japanese people which eventually would have to be closed up. I called a meeting of all of the licensed trustees under the Bankruptcy Act in Vancouver, and assembled them in the Hotel Vancouver. I told them of this rather formidable task which was confronting the custodian for which, at the moment, he had to improvise a staff and I requested their co-operation. I might say that co-operation was very widely extended. From memory I said that I arrived in Vancouver on March 9, and I find here that I held a meeting on the 10th of March at which every licensed trustee in bankruptcy for the area attended. There was a large number of gentlemen present and they agreed to give assistance to the custodian's staff, more particularly in relation to these very small businesses. Those gentlemen did, I believe, contribute very substantially in the way of advice and help in handling this situation. The custodian as such, however, had nothing to do with these motor vehicles, cameras, radio receiving sets, etc., which were turned over to the police under orders, which were all matters of record.

Mr. FLEMING: All other assets apart from those were vested in the custodian?

The WITNESS: Yes.

Mr. STEWART: Might I ask what happened to these radios and automobiles?

The WITNESS: In line with what you are asking, we did sell the radios. They were turned over to us. They were taken possession of by the R.C.M.P. and were turned over by the R.C.M.P. to the custodian who disposed of them along with the other effects of the Japanese.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. And was that done in the same manner as the other chattels were disposed of?—A. Precisely the same procedure was followed.

Q. Was the basis of the valuation and sale the same as you have referred to in your opening testimony about the other chattels?—A. Identical. We sold them by public auction.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-36
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Q. I think you have made it clear, but I just want to clarify this additional feature. All sales made at any time by the custodian, whether real estate, chattels, or other forms of property were in all cases sold for cash?—A. Excuse me, I am sorry if I have left that impression. The greater Vancouver property was sold for cash. With respect to rural properties outside of the sale to the Veterans' Land Act, the committee did agree that in certain cases properties could be sold with a substantial cash payment, at least fifty per cent, and limited terms would be allowed. Payment in full was to be made within two years at five per cent interest. There were quite a number of properties sold on that basis but all of those properties now, with the exception of perhaps half a dozen, have been fully paid off because the terms were short. It was a substantial cash payment and the terms were not more than two years. There were quite a number of rural properties sold on that basis but there was no urban property sold in that manner.

By Mr. Jaenicke:

Q. That would be those on the third sheet?—A. No, those were just the forty-three which were withdrawn from the Veterans' Land Act, but we had four or five hundred other properties outside of Greater Vancouver.

Q. They were all sold for cash?—A. You are speaking of the Veterans' Land Act deal and the question now is on other deals and I am saying the greater Vancouver properties were sold for cash but the other properties, the other 400 odd, were sold in some cases on terms.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. The question was a little different I think. Were those 43 properties referred to in the third list this morning sold for cash?—A. Not of necessity. They were rural properties and some of them may have been sold on terms.

Q. Was there any variety in those terms or was the proposition always in the same form, either cash, or at least 50 per cent cash and two years with 5 per cent interest?—A. That was it.

Q. And these credit terms were not given in the case of the sale of chattels?—A. No, no.

Q. Only real estate?—A. Yes.

Q. Dealing with the basis of the valuation of the other properties, and here we get away entirely from this sale to the Veterans' Land Act, you have indicated that there was a valuation made at the time of the sale. Does that apply generally to all the real estate in the hands of the custodian, greater Vancouver, and the rural areas, excluding of course that land sold to the Veterans' Land Act administration?—A. Yes, appraisals were made somewhat prior to the time that they were offered for sale by our department.

Q. Well on page 55 of the report I see these figures. The sale of 466 properties in greater Vancouver were appraised by your office, on page 55.—A. Yes.

Q. Appraised by your office at $915,600 and sold at $1,004,785.—A. That is correct, yes.

Q. The sales there netted about ten per cent in excess of your appraisal?—A. Yes.

Q. And those appraisals were made within a reasonable period prior to the sale so that the appraisal was strictly relative to the sale?—A. Definitely.

Q. And now, in connection with the other rural properties, excluding the 741, your appraisal was $529,146.25 and the sale yielded $570,244.—A. That is correct.

Q. That is eight per cent in advance of the appraisal?—A. Yes.

Q. And your remarks about the time of the appraisal would apply to those properties also?—A. Yes. The appraisal would be within a few months prior to that.

Q. Now when you had the appraisals made, you referred to the fact that you selected a number of leading experts in real estate values. Were those experts located first, the group in greater Vancouver and then the rural properties, in the respective areas?—A. Yes.

Q. Now did you spread those around in order to have a good cross-section of opinion in your appraisals?—A. Yes, I would say so. You will remember that I mentioned the appraisers were suggested to us by the real estate board of Vancouver and the real estate board of Victoria. That is, those boards stated certain people might be available and also qualified to make appraisals. In the greater Vancouver area there were just six real estate appraisers used. I could not give you the number in the rural areas because that was a large number. If we were dealing in Nanaimo it would be a real estate agent at Nanaimo who would make the appraisal and if it were at Cumberland it would be a Cumberland man. The men who made the appraisal had knowledge of the district in which they were appraising.

Q. I had intended to ask you how many men actually made appraisals for you in those two groups, first of all, the greater Vancouver group?—A. I could give you that, there were six appraisers.

Q. Any two on the same property?—A. In a few cases that was done. If there appeared to the committee to be any particular reason why any appraisal might be challenged we had another appraisal made or perhaps two appraisers went together but that was not the usual procedure.

Q. When you spoke of making the sale at the appraised value, which valuation would you take in those cases where you had the check valuation made?—A. It was submitted to the advisory committee and, usually, the reason for having another valuation would be this. Supposing the valuation was $3,000 and we called for tenders and the tenders that were received indicated that nobody wanted to pay more than $2,300. In that case the committee would say they would have another appraisal made. Assuming that the other appraisal came back and was a little less than the first appraisal, the committee would compromise and take the average between the two.

Q. But it was based on the valuation?—A. It was based on the valuation, yes.

Q. Now, continuing on to another subject entirely. Are you in a position to make any estimate of the losses by theft and vandalism?—A. No, I do not think I am. I would like the committee to have in mind, that as I have described, there was a considerable amount of theft and vandalism. That is quite true and we cannot get away from it. However, I do not want the committee to feel that the major portion of the Japanese goods disappeared in that way. In some areas and in some places a particular Japanese may have been unfortunately in the position of having a large amount of his stuff pilfered but in other cases none, or very little disappeared. I would not care to give an overall estimate in dollars and cents. That is what you are thinking of?

Q. Well, some approximation.—A. No, I do not think I would care to.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-37
www.nikkeimuseum.org

By Mr. Johnston:

Q. Was there any protection, when you took over the property, to look after it and prevent that sort of thing?—A. As I indicated we had 8,000 units of chattels and they were spread around the whole of the protected area. We did have co-operation from the police and we had our own policemen in one location.

Q. How many would you have of your own police?—A. We only had one employed by ourselves and that was at the request of the local police at Steveston. Then we had night patrols in Vancouver.

Q. How many patrols did you have?—A. Just one night patrol.

Q. Consisting of one man?—A. It was Wilson's night patrol and whether they employed more than one I do not know but they made regular inspections at stated and irregular hours. They operated in the same fashion as a night patrol usually operates.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Do you attach responsibility to anyone in connection with these losses by theft and vandalism? Are there any cases where the local authorities did not measure up to their responsibilities?—A. Just what is that?

Q. Can you place responsibility for theft and vandalism on anyone?—A. No, we cannot. The police informed us on different occasions that places had been broken into. Their conclusion usually was that it was juvenile delinquents who were the cause of it.

Mr. CASE: Was there any action or any criminal proceedings taken against anyone?

The WITNESS: Not at all.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, it is now after 1.00 o'clock and I would ask your opinion as to the next sitting. I would say that to-morrow there are a great number of committees sitting, six committees as a matter of fact, in the morning and two in the afternoon. I do not know if you feel that we should sit this afternoon instead of to-morrow morning because of that fact. I leave it entirely up to the committee to decide.

Mr. STEWART: Could the steering committee get together on this?

The Acting CHAIRMAN: In other words we will adjourn to the call of the chair?

Mr. FLEMING: Well, had we not better leave the meeting stand as arranged. I understand it is on the list for to-morrow. After all, Mr. Shears wants to get back to Vancouver sometime. However, perhaps he likes it so well down here he will want to stay.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: Well we will adjourn until 11.30 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The meeting adjourned at 1.05 p.m. to meet again to-morrow morning, May 13, at 11.00 o'clock.

APPENDIX "A"

P.C. 5523

AT THE GOVERNMENT HOUSE AT OTTAWA

MONDAY, the 29th day of June, 1942.

PRESENT:

HIS EXCELLENCY
THE GOVERNOR GENERAL IN COUNCIL:

Whereas the Minister of Mines and Resources and the Minister of Pensions and National Health report that persons of the Japanese race ordinarily resident in the protected areas of British Columbia have been required by Orders of the Minister of Justice, under Regulation 4 of the Defence of Canada Regulations (Consolidation) 1941, to leave such protected areas;

That many such persons of the Japanese race were or are engaged in agriculture and have been or shall be compelled to abandon farming operations on land owned by them or by companies which they control;

That it is in the public interest to ascertain the actual number of such Japanese farms, to carry out an appraisement of their fair present day value, and to consolidate the control of the disposition of these lands by sale, lease, or otherwise;

And whereas the Ministers are of the opinion that by reason of the state of war now existing it is advisable for the security of peace, order and welfare of Canada to make provision for the matter aforesaid;

Now, therefore, His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Mines and Resources and the Minister of Pensions and National Health and under the authority of the War Measures Act, Chapter 206 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1927, is pleased to make the following regulations and they are hereby made and established accordingly:

REGULATIONS

1. In these regulations, unless the context otherwise requires:
(a) "Director" means the Director of Soldier Settlement of Canada;
(b) "Japanese Company" means any corporation of which the majority of the shares issued by it are owned by persons of the Japanese race, or of which the majority of the directors are persons of the Japanese race;
(c) "Agricultural land" means land and any real or immovable property and any interest, legal or equitable therein, and the right to possession thereof, situated otherwise than within the boundaries of any incorporated city or town;
(d) "Minister" means the Minister of Mines and Resources;
(e) "person of the Japanese race" means any person wholly of the Japanese race;
(d) "protected area in British Columbia" means any area in the province of British Columbia, now or hereafter declared, pursuant to the provisions of Regulation 4 of the Defence of Canada Regulations (Consolidation) 1941, to be a protected area for the purpose of such Regulation.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-38
www.nikkeimuseum.org

2. Except with the approval in writing of the Director and in accordance with any terms or conditions therein set out, no person shall, after the date hereof,

(i) purchase, lease or otherwise acquire or agree to purchase, lease or otherwise acquire, or
(ii) either for himself or on behalf of the owner, sell, lease or otherwise dispose of or agree to sell, lease or otherwise dispose of,

any agricultural land in a protected area of British Columbia, owned by any person of the Japanese race or by any Japanese Company.

3. The Director may, in his sole discretion, refuse to approve or approve, either unconditionally or subject to such terms or conditions as to him seem fair and reasonable, the purchase, sale, lease or other acquisition or disposition, or any agreement therefor, of any agricultural land in a protected area of British Columbia owned by any person of the Japanese race or by any Japanese company.

4. The Director shall cause an appraisal to be made of the fair present-day value of all agricultural lands in any protected area of British Columbia owned by persons of the Japanese race or by Japanese companies, and shall report thereon to the Minister.

5. Any person authorized in writing by the Director to act as an inspector under these regulations may, for the purpose of making any appraisal under the last preceding section, or for the purpose of ascertaining whether any person of the Japanese race or any Japanese company is the owner of any agricultural land in a protected area of British Columbia, or for the purpose of determining whether the provisions of these regulations are being or have been complied with,

(i) enter at all reasonable times and inspect any agricultural land in a protected area of British Columbia, owned by any person of the Japanese race or by any Japanese company, or which is reasonably believed by such inspector to be or to have been owned by any such person or company;
(ii) examine orally any person occupying or having any interest in agricultural land in a protected area of British Columbia, which is reasonably believed by such inspector to be or to have been owned by a person of the Japanese race or a Japanese company;
(iii) require any person occupying or having any interest in agricultural land in a protected area of British Columbia, which is reasonably believed by such inspector to be owned by a person of the Japanese race or a Japanese Company, or having in his possession any documents relating to any such land, to furnish any information in his possession or such documents to such inspector.

6. The production by any person of any document purporting to be signed by the Director and purporting to authorize such person to act as an inspector under these regulations, shall be evidence of the authority of such person to act as an inspector.

7. Any person,

(i) who purchases, leases, or otherwise acquires, or sells, leases or otherwise disposes of or agrees to purchase lease or otherwise acquire, or to sell, lease or otherwise dispose of, any agricultural land in any protected area of British Columbia, owned by any person of the Japanese race or by any Japanese company otherwise than in accordance with these regulations; or
(ii) who wilfully delays or obstructs an inspector in the exercise of any power conferred upon him under these regulations; or
(iii) who fails to give any information or to produce any documents in his possession if required to do so under these regulations; or
(iv) who refuses to reply to any reasonable question asked him by an inspector acting under these regulations,

shall be guilty of an offence and liable, on summary conviction, to a fine not exceeding one thousand dollars or to imprisonment for a period not exceeding six months or to both such fine and such imprisonment.

8. The burden of proof that any purchase, sale, lease or other acquisition or disposition, or any agreement therefor, of any agricultural land in a protected area of British Columbia, is not a violation of any of the provisions of these regulations, shall be upon the accused.

9. Nothing in these regulations shall be deemed to apply to, or to affect enemy property as defined by the CONSOLIDATED REGULATIONS RESPECTING TRADING with the ENEMY (1939).

10. All expenses or costs incurred by the Director in connection with this Order shall be payable out of the moneys appropriated by Parliament to carry out measures deemed necessary in consequence of a state of war.

(Sgd.) A. D. P. HEENEY,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

APPENDIX "B"

LIST MADE BY CUSTODIAN—OWNER'S VALUATION ADDED

File No.: 8666
Name: NAOCHI KARATSU
Registration No.: 12051
Address: 19th Avenue, Whonnock, B.C.

October 28, 1942.

Inventory of Chattels Left on Property

Articles	*Value*	*Remarks*
3 mahogany planks 1" x 12" x 4'....	$ 3.00	
1 large box school supplies.....	5.00	
2 boxes containing 14 pieces glass....	2.50	
1 parcel containing Jap. Dragon kite	2.00	
3 steel bed springs.....	2.00	(2) were sent to Sandon where this man was living upon his request.
2 mattresses	8.00	
1 willow pattern platter.....	1.00	
3 boxes Mason jars and caps.....	2.50	
1 basket kitchen utensils.....	4.00	
2 packets wall paste.....	.50	
1 gramophone and records.....	50.00	80 records.
2 double bed stands.....	15.00	
1 rice bowl brass bound.....	1.00	
1 5-gal. crock.....	1.50	
1 piano stool.....	1.00	
3 dining chairs.....	3.00	
1 kitchen chair.....	.50	
2 piece linoleum mats.....	5.00	
2 rubber mats.....	1.00	
1 office file.....	.75	
1 spring bed.....	2.00	
1 iron kettle.....	1.00	

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-10-14 14:14:39
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Inventory of Chattels Left on Property—*Con.*

Articles	*Value*	*Remarks*
1 large box containing:		
ship's compass	18.00	
water pump	8.00	
steering wheel	2.50	
fog horn	1.00	
tin shears		
large quantity fishing tackle	160.00	Including: 1 good condition high-tension magnet (cost $80.00); 1 quart water kent coil (cost $15.00); 1 doz. bearings, $15.00; 10 sprockets, $12.00; 12 paint brushes, $30.00.
small vice	2.00	
quantity pipe fittings	2.00	
quantity brass odds and ends	2.00	
large quantity nuts and bolts	1.00	
misc. boat fittings	1.00	
large box containing Christmas decorations	2.00	
Approx. 6 lbs. sheet lead	.75	
5 window blinds	1.25	
1 poor umbrella		
4 shallow boxes	1.00	
1 tool box containing	107.50	Fishing gear for commercial purpose. New 200 fathoms stainless trolling wire (cost $30.00); new, 100 fish hooks for pilchard bait (cost $7.50); 200 spoon hook for Cohoe trolling (cost $70.00).
1 carton Christmas decorations	1.00	
3 small sheet brass (approx. 2 lbs.)	1.50	
small quantity wire	1.50	
1 box containing:		
2 clocks		
thermos bottles	1.50	
small quantity dishes	2.00	
2 biscuit tins containing 5 pint sealers		
1 wooden tray		
10 bundles books tied	5.00	
1 pair gum boots	1.00	
3 lengths stove pipe	.15	
2 lanterns	1.00	
1 gas iron	1.00	
1 box books	1.00	
1 gas lamp shade	.15	
4 bundles lumber	4.00	
4 posts 2" x 2" tied 6' long		
1 lamp base (cracked)		
1 roast tin containing:		
10 cups	1.00	
4 wooden bowls		
3 quart sealers	.25	
2 pails	.50	
1 box old clothes		
2 Japanese flashlights		
3 small Christmas decorations	.50	
1 bag containing brass wire	1.00	
4 hats		
1 aluminum pulley 10"	1.00	
1 8' belt	2.00	
1 candy pail	.25	
4 Japanese calendar pictures	.15	

Inventory of Chattels Left on Property—*Con.*

Articles	*Value*	*Remarks*
1 crockery bowl		
2 aluminum pots		
2 bake pans	.25	
1 canvas life preserver	1.00	
1 large ball peen hammer		
5 lbs. grease proof paper		
3 deep sea fishing lures		
1 sad iron		
Downstairs		
1 chesterfield chair		Was sent to owner upon request.
1 chest of drawers (no drawers)	3.00	
2 small tables (h.m.)	2.00	
4 pictures and frame		
1 food cupboard	1.00	
2 wooden bowls (small)		
1 home made wood bed	1.00	
1 gal. candy jar		
1 Japanese tub full cont. unknown		
1 Japanese bowl (2 piece)		
1 metal box		
linoleum on front room	2.00	
1 sea shell ash tray		
1 wedge	.15	
small quantity fishing tackles	2.00	
1 pair binoculars (poor)		
small piece linoleum on kitchen floor	1.00	
few Japanese decorations on wall		
Basement		
3 shallow boxes		
1 lid for 5-gal. crock		
small quantity fir wood		

This represents all my chattels remaining in any protected area of British Columbia.

Confirmed:

Date: ..... Signed: ....

Please sign and return one copy to the Custodian.

CANADA

DEPARTMENT OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE
OFFICE OF THE CUSTODIAN

JAPANESE EVACUATION SECTION

Phone Pacific 6131
Please Refer to
File No. 8666

506 Royal Bank Bldg.,
Hastings and Granville,
Vancouver, B.C.

APRIL 25, 1947.

Mr. NAOICHI KARATSU,
Registration No. 12051,
Harris Ranch,
New Denver, B.C.

DEAR SIR,—In reply to your letter of March 15 in which you ask that certain chattels be sent to you, we have to advise that we are unable to ship these articles as some have been sold at auction and others are missing. The books

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-40
www.nikkeimuseum.org

were badly mildewed and damaged and were discarded as being of no value. We are enclosing an itemized statement of the articles sold at auction and the balance not shown on this sheet were either stolen or damaged and declared of no value.

Referring to your enquiry as to expenses against your boats; these expenses are proportionate charges covering supervision, insurance and survey expenses actually paid out. No office expenses or commission on the sales have been charged.

Your account has now been credited with the sum of $43.50 representing $21.75 on each boat covering a transportation claim from Steveston to Tofino. These amounts have been credited as it is understood that you delivered one boat and paid the expenses on the other one on the trip down and return to Tofino. We would appreciate your confirmation that this is correct.

A statement of your account is enclosed and these funds are available to you on request.

Yours truly,

W. E. ANDERSON,
Farm Department.

WEA:OH
Enc.
Name, Karatsu, Naoichi
Registration No. 12051. File No. 8666.

The following chattles were sold by public auction at Mission, B.C. on March 7 and 14, 1945.

Spring		$ 1.25
2 Springs and bed		.35
Kitchen utensils		.25
Broken gramophone		1.10
Kitchen chair and mat		.45
Box fittings and sundries		2.25
Fishing tackle and old net		1.00
Christmas decorations		.35
Box of sundries		.50
Lantern		.25
Kitchen utensils		.60
Aluminum pulley		.50
Bowl		.60
2 Pots		.35
Fish lines and iron		.60
Total		$10.40
Less Expenses: Auctioneer's Fee.	$1.04	
Advertising	.13	
Moving	2.87	$ 4.04
Net Proceeds Credited		$ 6.36

Members of Custodian Staff Present: Mr. W. E. Anderson.
Extracted from Auctioneering List No.: Mission 18.
Remarks:

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-41
www.nikkeimuseum.org

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

SESSION 1947

HOUSE OF COMMONS

STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 7

TUESDAY, MAY 13, 1947

WITNESSES:

Dr. E. H. Coleman, C.M.G., K.C., Deputy Custodian of Enemy Property; Mr. F. G. Shears, Director Vancouver Office, and Mr. K. W. Wright, Counsel.

OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., B.A., L.Ph.,
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
1947

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, May 13, 1947.

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts met at 11.30 o'clock a.m., Mr. Roch Pinard presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Burton, Case, Cleaver, Cote (*Verdun*), Cloutier, Cruickshank, Fleming, Fournier (*Maisonneuve-Rosemont*), Gladstone, Golding, Jaenicke, Kirk, Marshall, Pinard, Raymond (*Wright*), Richard (*Gloucester*), Stewart (*Winnipeg North*), Stuart (*Charlotte*), Thatcher.

In attendance: Dr. E. H. Coleman, C.M.G., K.C., Deputy Custodian of Enemy Property; Mr. F. G. Shears, Director of the Vancouver Office, and Mr. K. W. Wright, Counsel.

The Committee resumed its investigation into the administration of the Vancouver Office of the Custodian.

Examination of Mr. Shears was continued.

Mr. Shears answered certain questions put to him at the last meeting regarding the policing of Japanese property.

On motion of Mr. Cruickshank:

Ordered, That a copy of a *General Report to the Minister*, dated January 15, 1947, be made available to each member of the Committee.

Mr. Shears undertook to supply the Committee with a breakdown of certain items in the Statement of Receipts and Expenditures, Japanese Evacuation Section, for the period March, 1942 to July 31, 1943.

Mr. Shears tabled *Original Offer of the Director, The Veterans' Land Act, for the Purchase of 769 Parcels of Farm Lands from the Custodian of Enemy Property* and an additional offer for the purchase of 42 parcels, which are printed as *Appendices A* and *B* to this day's minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Dr. Coleman undertook to furnish the Committee with the audited statement of accounts of the Vancouver office to December 31, 1946, at the earliest opportunity.

At 1.00 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned to meet at the call of the Chair.

A. L. BURGESS,
Clerk of the Committee.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-42
www.nikkeimuseum.org

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
May 13, 1947.

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts met this day at 11.30 a.m. The Acting Chairman, Mr. Roch Pinard, presided.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: Will you come to order gentlemen? As I mentioned yesterday, we will proceed with the same item of business, that is the examination of Mr. Shears. Now as Mr. Fleming mentioned yesterday, Mr. Shears is anxious to go back to Vancouver and I hope the questions will be brief and to the point and that perhaps we will be able to dispose of this this morning. Mr. Shears would like to make a brief statement and I will give him the floor.

Frank G. Shears, Director of the office of the Custodian, Vancouver, recalled:

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, in reply to a specific question asked by Mr. Johnston yesterday regarding the number of policemen employed by the custodian you will recall that I gave the answer that we employed only one policeman and used one night patrol. That statement is correct as far as it went. We did only have one man who was sworn in as a policeman and that was done at the suggestion of the police authorities in the Steveston area. We only had one night patrol service and a night patrol is of course only suitable for a city district. We had the Wilson night patrol in Vancouver. I would not like the committee to think, however, that was the only supervision that was given. We had a protection department of our own and in Vancouver we had four men all the time, who were specifically employed for this purpose. Also in the Fraser Valley we had four men continually going around that area who were supplied with automobiles to help them. From time to time, when places were broken into it was reported to the office and such places were boarded up. For purposes of the record I would just like to add this statement that I have made. I would not want the committee to think we just had one night patrol and one policeman.

Also, in respect to the question regarding prosecutions, while no actual prosecutions were taken by the custodian, on several occasions the police did recover stolen things and our protection department was able to identify them. No specific charge however was laid.

Mr. STEWART: In connection with that, Mr. Shears, would you mind looking for a moment at exhibit A, the Ross account. That is a statement of receipts and disbursements by the protective department. The P. S. Ross account. You will see it a little way down from the top.

Mr. FLEMING: At the back of the report.

Mr. STEWART: Under travelling, hotel, and living expenses of the protection department, can you give a breakdown of the expenditure which occurred between March, 1942, and July, 1943?

The WITNESS: That would be in connection with the department to which I have just made reference and in addition it would cover what I might call the

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-43
www.nikkeimuseum.org

initial protection work, that is to say, the visiting of all property and the arranging for movement of goods from individual houses where the Japanese had been living to the central storages. I could not possibly give you a breakdown here in Ottawa, but it could be broken down by the accounting records at Vancouver. That definitely is a charge, I would say, made up entirely of salaries and expenses of the men employed in that specific service and it was called our protection department.

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. Salaries and travelling expenses?—A. Yes, salaries and travelling expenses and car expenses, and I think that would be the bulk of it.

Q. Have you had any accounts after the 31st of July, 1943, in connection with this division?—A. There is a monthly statement taken off by our accounting department, that is done continually each month.

Q. Were the transactions audited after the 31st of March, 1943?—A. There has been no complete audit since that date. There is, however, an audit in progress now. It has been in progress for about seven weeks now.

Q. Who has been doing it?—A. P. S. Ross & Sons have been engaged to audit the evacuee section of the Vancouver office.

Q. I take it there was no yearly audit.—A. No, there was no yearly audit.

Q. Can you tell me why there was no yearly audit carried out? I am thinking that it would have been in your interests and for your own protection and it would have been very advisable, would it not?—A. It was a matter regarding which I just waited to receive instructions. As I say statements were prepared every month and forwarded to Ottawa.

Q. A complete and detailed audit is being done now up until what date?—A. The 31st of December.

Q. Of last year?—A. Of last year.

Mr. GLADSTONE: Mr. Chairman, the witness has in his hand a large book, apparently containing figures relating to this whole story. I notice also a similar book is in the hands of Mr. Fleming and in the hands of Mr. Stewart but there is no such book apparently in the hands of any member of the government. I am just wondering why, for instance, my friend Mr. Cruickshank who is very interested in this matter has got a copy of that information?

The Acting CHAIRMAN: Well, these books are in possession of members of the steering committee and they are not available for distribution to the other members but one can easily be borrowed from the chairman.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I just want to register my own objection. I just want to say that I have asked already for some things but I would like now to ask for all the information, all the little letters and all the other things that are concerned here. We have spent the last couple of days discussing the Fraser Valley and I can quite modestly say that I am the only member of this committee who knows anything about the Fraser Valley in spite of the fact that I keep trying to put its name before the public. I strenuously object to all this discussion by people from Toronto and people from Saskatchewan who never saw a Jap or a Japanese farm in their lives And it is not so much the discussion I object to but until a while ago they were not very much interested in the whole matter. I, however, have to report back to the people of British Columbia as to whether we have done the fair thing by the Japanese or not and whether we can justify any recommendation which we make or not. My legal friends have been cross-examining the witness as if he was up on the Dick murder trial and I notice he refers frequently to the book and I have no idea what is in that book.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: Well, if you will just let me explain.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Just a moment Mr. Chairman. We are here to decide on perhaps the spending of hundreds of thousands of dollars and if the members of the committee cannot have a few dollars to print extra books I do not know why. How can any member of this committee make a recommendation one way or the other? I certainly intend, when these recommendations go before the House, whatever they are, from this committee, I am going to have quite a bit to say. Apparently, it was arranged that those who had no information and knew nothing about this matter, never had the slightest interest in the Japanese problem and said nothing about it ever since the war started, now having become eminent counsel, have this all at their fingertips and those of us who know something about it have not those facilities.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: I am inclined to believe that Mr. Cruickshank is right in some respects. When the procedure was first discussed by the committee it was then understood that the members of the steering committee would get copies of this report and it seemed to be agreed at the time. That is the reason why only the members of the steering committee have copies.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I would like to know how many copies were originally printed and the names of those who received them?

The Acting CHAIRMAN: I think some of the members of the steering committee who are here could explain the way it was done.

Mr. BURTON: Mr. Chairman, I was waiting until you were through with Mr. Cruickshank before I was going to ask for the floor. I may say, for the information of those members who were not present at the first meeting, that while it was pointed out that there were not sufficient copies of this book to go around to every member of the public accounts committee, we were asked that each member of the steering committee make his copy available to the members of the party that he was representing on the steering committee. I have done that and that is the book that Mr. Stewart has in so far as the group he represents is concerned. It was pointed out at that time that if more copies were needed, and if the committee felt that it would warrant the expense, consideration would be given to printing more. This, however, is the first time that it has been brought to the attention of the committee and I would suggest in all fairness to the members of the steering committee that Mr. Cruickshank contact his represenative of the steering committee. As far as his comment about people from Saskatchewan taking up the time of this committee—

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I did not say that.

Mr. BURTON: You said substantially that. I would point out to the committee that we members from Saskatchewan have taken up very little time of the committee. We have followed not only the discussion very closely but we have followed the explanations given by Mr. Shears very closely because it is something that we want to familiarize ourselves with. Again I would say, Mr. Chairman, that if more copies of this report are required by government members and if they need them in their work and the steering committee cannot supply them, then I am quite prepared to support the motion that more copies be made available.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I want to make it clear I did not say that you gentlemen were taking up too much time of the committee. I said they had not taken an interest in the past. I am not objecting to Mr. Stewart or to anybody else and I think you should support me in what I am saying because it is true that every member of the committee should have one of these copies. I am not objecting to Mr. Fleming or to Mr. Stewart at all and I think Mr. Fleming and Mr. Stewart would be the first ones to endorse what I am saying. This is my motion and you can express your opinion. I do not know who the member of

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-44
www.nikkeimuseum.org

the Liberal party on the steering committee is and I do not care. Surely we are not here as parties. I am going to move now that each member of the committee be provided with a copy of this book.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: In the meantime I might add there are two extra copies in the possession of Mr. Isnor and I am sure that Mr. Cruickshank and Mr. Gladstone could get those copies but as far as the motion is concerned I leave it in the hands of the committee to decide.

Mr. STEWART: May I ask for some information? I think at the first meeting when we were discussing this I asked that they be made available for each member. I suggested that the report be printed as an appendix at least and that I thought everyone should have a copy. Now the steering committee took that under advisement and I would like to know what decision they came to? I would like to know why only one copy was made available for the five members of our group.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: I am told that the members of the steering committee who received copies of the report were: Mr. Burton, Mr. Fleming, Mr. Gibson, Mr. Marshall, and Mr. Stewart. There are also two extra copies as I have said which are still in the possession of the chairman. Those copies were to be made available to the members who needed them. Now I think it might take a little time to have these copies printed but I think the motion is in order and I will ask the committee to decide on it.

Mr. FLEMING: Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate this question was not raised at the first meeting when this matter was considered, because if members, such as the honourable member for Fraser Valley, feel that they have been under handicap in following the examination then it may be that it will be necessary to detain Mr. Shears here for questioning on the basis of the need for perusal of these reports, by members of the committee who have not yet seen them. Now this matter arose in the first meeting of the steering committee because it was stated to us by the government that they had just eight copies of the report available. There was a desire expressed that we should not go to the expense of having additional copies printed or mimeographed unless the members really wanted it. Now the volume itself, as you can see, is very bulky and in view of that suggestion from the government that printing and mimeographing of copies be obviated unless strictly necessary. The suggestion was advanced not from the opposition parties but from the government party representatives and the steering committee that we see if we could get along with the copies that were available for distribution among the parties through their representatives on the steering committee and then if it was found impossible to get along with the limited supply the question could be raised. It was expected each member of the steering committee would make his copy available to the members of his group. Now I recall that I pointed out to the representatives of the two main parties, who have more members, that it would mean that there would be a great many members competing for the use of one copy. It was left that way and apparently these two copies have not been drawn on. If the information that those reports were available was not more widely known to the members of the committee it was perhaps due to the fact that there were members absent from the first business meeting of this committee when the matter was fully discussed.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Before the motion is put I would say that I was not present at the first meeting and I am not complaining of the distribution made so far. I do think, however, in a matter which is as important as this, the information should be available. Somebody has said the government did not want to go to the expense of printing additional copies and I would say that I do not always agree with some of the ideas of the government and I do not intend to agree in the future, but would only go to a very little expense and

there are a lot of unemployed stenographers in Canada whom we might get to work on it and we might even get hold of some of these Japanese to type a few of the copies. I would like to see the motion put.

Mr. RICHARD: No one has said anything about how much it would cost and how long it would take to have these copied. Personally I have not got a copy and I have not seen one and I think some of the members of the committee may be in the same situation. I think some of the members here, including Mr. Cruickshank, certainly should have a copy available but I do not want to see us waiting to get copies of the report unless it is absolutely necessary. I certainly do not complain because I did not get one myself and I think we should find out first what it will cost and secondly how long it will take.

Mr. FLEMING: Mr. Chairman, the short way would probably be to find out how many of the members of the committee want a copy of the report and who are not content with the copies on the present basis. I have no doubt Mr. Cruickshank who has a special interest in this matter, should have one. There is not, however, much point in our passing the resolution unless other members want the copies and are going to use them.

Mr. COTE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to clear up one point. Mr. Fleming has indicated that Mr. Cruickshank was a little late in raising this question. Now if I refer to the minutes of the proceedings I see that on May 8 the steering committee made its recommendation that the officer in charge of Vancouver office of the custodian be examined. I would assume that it is only on May 8 that this matter was brought up and inquiries were to be made regarding printing and availability of these financial reports so I do not see that Mr. Cruickshank is late in bringing up this point. I am also interested in what he is claiming as a privilege to the members of the committee. I have not had a report to study and I think it should be left to the committee to decide if it is advisable to print more copies at this time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: I am informed the matter was brought up on the 28th of April at the first meeting.

Mr. COTE: Not according to the official record.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: It was not reported but it was discussed at the very first meeting. Now I shall add this, also. We have gone quite far already into the evidence and the examination of Mr. Shears and I do not know how long it will still take and I have not the faintest idea as to the cost of printing of this report but as far as delay is concerned it will probably take a week or so.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: May I point out that it would delay Mr. Shears as I see it. This is not printed, it is only typed and I do not see it delaying us at all. I am not asking that we start all over again by any manner of means. If I have to justify to the people of British Columbia any action I have taken in this committee or that anybody else has taken, I can only justify it from one part of the score and I can see very little cost involved in typing a few of these. I would say that as far as these binders and so on are concerned that I have thrown away thousands of them every day which come from eastern Canada advertising various things. If the motion is defeated it is all right with me and I will know exactly where I stand about having the information available.

Mr. STEWART: Might I point out in this statement here there was one item dealing with the Ottawa section of the custodian. There was also the matter of illegal organizations, both of which items I think would be interesting to the members and I think if we are going to do anything constructive or intelligent we ought to know what is being done in connection with those. I know that Mr. Jaenicke has had to go without this when I have had it and I know Mr. Burton has had to go without it when I have had it and we should evolve some method by which all of those who are interested can have copies.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-45
www.nikkeimuseum.org

The Acting Chairman: Certainly I have no objection and I would like to see the committee decide it immediately and take their stand on it.

Mr. Cote: How long would it require, Mr. Chairman, to obtain sufficient copies?

The Acting Chairman: I could not be definite, but I am informed that it would take about seven days.

Mr. Cruickshank: What difference does that make.

The Acting Chairman: I do not say it makes any difference. The only thing I am pointing out is that there would be a delay.

Mr. Cote: May I just inquire there whether it is worthwhile to continue to sit until such time as we all have copies?

The Acting Chairman: Well, is the motion agreeable?
Carried.

Now can we, in the meantime, continue the examination? I am in the hands of the committee as far as that is concerned.

Mr. Fleming: I think we should continue.

Mr. Stewart: There is another question I should like to ask Mr. Shears in connection with exhibit A, the Ross company's account. There were 466 properties appraised in greater Vancouver and 400 in the rural areas and I notice at the bottom of schedule A the advisory committee expenses in greater Vancouver were $3,761.02 whereas in connection with the rural property the expense was $1,151.03. Could Mr. Shears tell us why there is this discrepancy in the expenses? I would have thought the expenses in Vancouver would be much smaller than those in the rural areas.

The Witness: I indicated previously there was a somewhat different set-up in regard to the committees. In the greater Vancouver advisory committee under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice Sidney Smith it was his wish that the committee should have their own secretariat and their own office. Office space was rented and they had an executive officer and they had a stenographer and that was the reason for the expenses incurred by that particular committee. In regard to the rural committee under the chairmanship of Judge Whiteside, they met in the Judge's chambers and later on they met in Mayor Mott's office and they dispensed with any paid salary employees. Members are allowed an honorarium for attending committee meetings, and travelling expenses where required; very definitely the expenses of the greater Vancouver advisory committee are very much higher than those of the rural committee for the particular reasons given.

Q. Do we have a breakdown of those expenses?—A. That can be produced, yes.

Q. Then, further on, in that same exhibit, exhibit A, there is an amount of $15,402.01, in connection with storage, etc. I take it from that that not all chattels and goods stored were on Japanese property?—A. No, they were not. Referring to Vancouver again, because that is where we concentrated most of these chattels; at 992 Powell street, we had a storage space of four floors and the basement, and we paid $150 a month for the rental of that one building; and there were other buildings for which we paid rental in Vancouver and in some other areas; and it mentions freight as well. That item, I believe, would also include the charges for moving into storage.

Q. Yes?—A. But generally speaking that is the meaning of that item.

Q. Were there any break-ins, entries, made?—A. Yes, even at 992 Powell street, on several occasions entries were made. In some cases windows were removed. It was not in a particularly good district, right in the heart of Vancouver. That was one of the places, incidentally, which was under the protection of the night patrol. That simply meant of course that the patrol would be there perhaps around two o'clock in the morning and then again at five. And I understand their instructions were not always to be there at the same time. They would vary the time and the next night they might be there at two o'clock and four o'clock. But definitely 992 Powell street was broken into on several occasions.

Q. And I take it from what you have said that there would be no inventory of the goods held?—A. Yes. As it was placed in 992 Powell—there was no inventory actually made when the goods were put in there, but the Japanese name was marked on the goods.

Q. And they are all out of that Powell street storage now?—A. Yes, it is empty.

Q. And you made an inventory of the stuff that was removed?—A. Well, it was not actually an inventory. When the goods were moved to auction, a list of what was sold at auction was made. The auction list constituted an inventory of the property sold.

Q. Can you say how much was missing from that one building?—A. In volume, or value?

Q. Volume, roughly.—A. I believe I should tell you that this building was filled from floor to ceiling on more than one occasion. We had auctions held there on the ground floor over the period and the goods on the other floors were moved down and the spaces vacated on these other floors would be filled again. That building was filled on several occasions. I would not like to estimate the actual quantity. As a matter of fact it was not always a question of the goods being actually stolen, there was so much damage done and a mixing up of articles and so on took place. One would go in and here would be a lot of stuff pulled down and just thrown all over the floor.

Q. This is rather an important point, Mr. Chairman. There may be claims against the custodian for damage to goods. Apparently we do not know from official records just what this amounts to. There has been some measure of loss which either the federal government, or somebody, is going to have to pay the Japanese for. I think it would be very desirable for us to know just how much had been destroyed or lost. You say that from your books and records you have no certain way of knowing how much has been lost. Suppose a claim comes up for certain articles which are lost, how are you going to decide it?—A. We have files. We have a file for each individual Japanese, and we have the Japanese declaration as to what he left. In other cases subsequent declarations were made. In many cases it was possible to check these inventories. I would say the over-all basis on which claims, if claims are entertained, would have to be considered, would be by the file itself; and I believe, broadly speaking, that would substantiate what the Japanese lost; the records would show what had been sold, and in that way the discrepancy would be established. I will admit that it will not tie up one hundred per cent; but there again I ask your consideration to visualize not only the number of items, but the type of items—when you have to keep track of pots, pans and that sort of thing, it is understandable.

Q. It is understandable.—A. I would say an additional test would be whether the Japanese could prove what he left. As I say, that would be on our files. Then we could check that against what we sold, and in that way would know what was short.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. Cleaver: Mr. Fleming, are you finished with the witness?

Mr. Fleming: I don't want to monopolize the questioning. I can be finished in about twenty or twenty-five minutes.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-46
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: May I interrupt and ask one question before you go on?

Mr. FLEMING: Certainly.

By Mr. Cruickshank:

Q. I asked you, Mr. Shears, for a list of the sale prices to the VLA, that the sale price with respect to each property be put on the record. Has that been done?—A. I do not think it is actually in the record.

Q. It will be done?—A. Yes.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Another point is this; as I understand it, Mr. Chairman—and I do not profess to know anything about the value of property in the Fraser Valley—I am not even going to say whether this is a just complaint, I do not know whether it is or not. I want to find out. My point is as to the value of the properties. As I said before mention has been made by myself and others with respect to this matter. What I want to find out is the actual price, the actual cost of this land at the several stages, the price that was paid to the Japanese, the price that was paid by the V.L.A. administration, and the price at which it was sold to the veterans. I am particularly anxious to have that on the record. Although I come from that district I do not think anyone here would expect me to express an opinion either publicly or privately as to the value of that land. I think the list is one which should be on the records of this committee.

Mr. FLEMING: I think they all want to know that, and I think the committee has no intention of winding up its labours without getting that information.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: That is the information I want.

Mr. FLEMING: I understood the chairman was going to arrange to have that evidence adduced before the committee by representatives from the Veterans Affairs department.

The CHAIRMAN: No, he is not.

Mr. FLEMING: I raised the question as to how we were going to get this information at the last meeting and the chairman intimated that a witness would be called from the Veterans Affairs department to testify as to the price charged to the veteran on re-sale by Veterans' Land Act officials. I understood from the vice-chairman that arrangements were being made to call someone from the Veterans Affairs department presumably Mr. Murchison, because he is the official who conducted the correspondence which was referred to yesterday on behalf of the Veterans' Land Act.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Mr. Chairman, following up what Mr. Fleming says, I agree with him in this, that it is the Veterans Affairs department obviously, the Veterans' Land Act officials, who are the ones who can answer about the sales. That matter is entirely in his department. In the meantime I am asking that this report be put in as an appendix to our records so we can have an opportunity of studying it. Apparently the price paid to the Japanese was $750, and we want to follow that through and see the price at which it was sold to the veteran. In the meantime, I am asking that that material be placed in our record.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: It will be put in the record.

The WITNESS: I would like to say to Mr. Cruickshank that all I am in a position to put in is this. It gives the custodian file number; it gives a certain number which relates itself to the veteran's land file; and it gives the Japanese name, the soldiers' settlement appraisal and the price paid to the Japanese.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: That is what I am asking for.

Mr. FLEMING: And it includes the price paid the Japanese?

The WITNESS: It gives the sale price of the property.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Of course, I appreciate that the witness can only give such information as he has.

The WITNESS: But there is no legal description of the property here, but it relates itself in two places; to the file number and also to the V.L.A. offer.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: By price do you mean the assessed value?

The WITNESS: The assessed value would have to be obtained and added to this list.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Mr. Chairman, before we adjourned yesterday Mr. Shears was giving testimony as to the vesting of property of all kinds in the custodian. What was the function of the custodian with respect to property? Was it his function to conserve and protect, and in due course when it was decided to sell, to sell at the best possible prices? How would you describe the proper function of the custodian?—A. Initially, the function of the Custodian's office in Vancouver was to protect and administer the properties of the Japanese which were either registered by the Japanese or, upon evacuation, became vested in the Custodian. This entailed the work which I have already indicated, the renting of properties, protection of their chattels so far as could be done, and so on. Then, when the policy of liquidation came into effect, the instructions were we were to proceed with liquidation in an orderly fashion; that properties were not to be sold unless there was a justification for the price obtained. In order to do that, the process which I have already outlined was adopted, public advertisement and tender. Does that answer your question?

Q. Not fully, but perhaps we can break it down. The orders in council themselves do not lay down a procedure to be followed with reference to advertising or obtaining valuations, do they? That was a matter of internal administration for the Custodian's office?—A. Yes, definitely.

Q. What was the overriding purpose of the Custodian's administration in that respect? Was it to obtain the best possible price for these properties and when I say "properties" I am speaking not only of the real estate but the chattels, all properties of the people of the Japanese race?—A. It was the purpose of the Vancouver office to obtain adequate prices.

Q. In other words, to get for those properties, whether real estate or chattels, all they were worth?—A. A fair market price.

Q. It was not any part of the function of the Custodian to sacrifice anything simply for the sake of a quick realization?—A. I would say not, no.

Q. Apart from the realization, the function and duty was to protect and conserve the assets?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, as to the Fraser Valley properties in this sale to the Veterans' Land Act. In the light of the information which has been detailed to the committee, do you think that the fair market price on those 741 properties, most in the Fraser Valley but some on Vancouver Island, was obtained in 1943?—A. From the evidence before the Custodian and the Advisory Committee at the time, it would appear that the best possible prices were obtained. In the light of some subsequent events and individual sales which were made, it might appear that some properties, had they been sold individually would have brought larger prices. I think there might have been some properties which would have been hard to sell in individual units and might still not be sold. I can only say that there was some upward trend in values which took place from the 1st of January, 1943, onwards. A slight increase took place in 1943, a little more in 1944, but the real upswing did not take place until 1945 and onward.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-47
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Q. You said yesterday the general increase in the price of real estate did not fully account for this great discrepancy as between the Custodian—at least the VLA appraisal and offer on the one hand and the realization on the properties in the same group later on?—A. It would not appear that way.

Q. You say it was the best possible price which could be obtained. Actually, no one else was ever invited to bid on these properties; is not that true?—A. That is true, but I say the best possible price in the light of the fact that the committee was considering selling these properties on the basis of the valuations which they believed were sound valuations due to the fact they were made by a qualified board of appraisers. That is the basis upon which the deal was consummated.

Q. We have these facts, that these properties were never offered for sale to anyone else?—A. They were not.

Q. No one else ever had an opportunity to bid on them?—A. No.

Q. The offer comes forward from the VLA which is eventually accepted after some negotiation. When you say it was the best possible price that could be obtained, what you mean I take it is, it was the best possible price you could obtain from the VLA purchasing en block under these conditions?—A. That is true.

Q. What charges have been made against the proceeds of the sale of both real estate and chattels? On the chattels you have indicated that there was a total of 21 or 22 per cent charged for auditor's charges— —A. Auctioneer's, not auditors.

Q. I should not say auditors, I meant auctioneers. You paid 10 per cent to the auctioneers, 3 per cent was allotted for advertising and about 9 per cent was your own expense in handling?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, that total of 22 per cent was charged against the sale of chattels, did that cover all the expense of the Custodian's office in connection with the sale of those chattels?—A. No.

Q. There was overhead, was there?—A. Simply the charges which related to the movement of these goods from perhaps one storage place to the auction room. It definitely related to the movement of these goods for the purpose of sale at auction.

Q. In other words, there is no overhead from the Custodian's office charged in?—A. No, not one dollar.

Q. Are those accounts available? I am not concerned, for the moment, about the details, but I think the committee ought to know what was the total charge of this kind made in respect of the realization on the chattels, those that were sold. If you have not that information handy do not take the time— —A. Yes, I think perhaps I can give you the totals. There was a total of 255 auctions.

Q. Excuse me, is that the total number of auctions on all chattels?—A. Yes.

Q. That is the total?—A. 255 auctions, the gross returns were $245,583. The auctioneers' fees were $24,873 which, you will notice, is approximately 10 per cent. There is one case in which there is a very slight variation. Advertising cost us $6,593 and the handling charge to which I have previously referred was $25,775.

Q. What was the net, then?—A. The net would be $188,341.76.

Mr. Stewart: May I interrupt to ask whether these figures appear on the accounts in the hands of some of the members of the committee?

The Witness: These auction sales figures will be included, with chattels sold by advertisement and tender. The proceeds would be included in the sale of chattels or something of that nature in exhibit A. The figures I have just read will not appear separately.

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. They do not appear in the auditor's accounts?—A. Oh no, that report is 1943.

Q. All these expenses took place after 1943?—A. Yes, right up to December, 1947.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. December, 1946?—A. Oh yes, December, 1946.

Q. We have not the details before us in any form. Now, in the exhibit to which you have just referred, Mr. Shears, the report of P. S. Ross & Sons, of October 20, 1943, there were some recommendations made with regard to administration in the Vancouver office. You were in charge of Vancouver office?—A. At that time, yes.

Q. Was that report with its recommendations brought to your attention?—A. Yes.

Q. I am not going to trouble you now about the details, but what, in general did you do in the light of the recommendations contained in that report?—A. We put them into effect.

Q. All of them?—A. I have not looked at the report for years, but I believe we did. They related, more or less, to internal management and the manner of keeping files. Have you anything specific in mind?

Q. There was just one point in particular on page 12 under the heading, evacuated persons, where the auditors speak of the custodian's 14,500 files concerning evacuated individuals. They say they examined a number of them and noted the information was generally in chronological order. Then, they made a statement.

> Adequate information relating to the sales of assets did not appear to be in the files.

Was that information available elsewhere? Was it just the fact that it was not in the statement?—A. It was available elsewhere and now is available in all files. In other words, that recommendation was carried out. The information was in the office but it was not, at that time, on all the files.

Q. Perhaps I did not clear up fully this point about charges made against the Japanese property. You dealt with the chattels and you have explained that. Now, what about the real estate. Apart from the expenses you incurred we will say, in the way of valuators' fees or expenses for sale, tender, auctioneering fees and so on, was there any charge made by the Custodian's office in connection with the realization on the real estate of the Japanese?—A. All properties, as you know—no, not all properties, but practically all properties, appeared in these two catalogues. Against each item of property you will have noticed the name of the real estate agent. The arrangement which was made was this; when that particular property was sold that real estate agent would be entitled to the usual real estate agent's commission of 5 per cent. This was paid and was deducted from the sale price. The cost of advertising the property was pro rated amongst all the Japanese properties and it was not particularly heavy. This was so because of the fact we advertised so many properties and assessed a proportion of the advertising. The charges for a particular individual were naturally fair.

Q. That was just a matter of pro rating, I suppose, in relation to the price of the real estate in each case?—A. Yes.

Q. That would just be an out of pocket expense and I am going further in my question and asking if there was any additional charge made by the Custodian's office, say for the expense of administration of Japanese property; first of all, the collecting, conserving and storing of it, and second, the realizing of it, was that borne by— —A. That was borne by the department.

Source: Nikkei National Museum 2018-16-1-45-1-48
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Q. Now, the source of the money out of which these charges were met was not the taxpayers money. Are you familiar with the details of that?—A. No, I can simply say in that connection we had advances from Ottawa for administrative charges in Vancouver.

Q. You are not in a position to offer information concerning the source of that money, whether it came from charges made on the administration of other property?—A. No, the accounts in Vancouver, at the present time show an indebtedness for advances made from Ottawa.

Q. Were these expenses all charged up, that is allowable expenses, all charged up against the individual account in each case?—A. Oh yes.

Q. You did keep individual records on all files?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Cleaver:

Q. I believe the witness said, in regard to the sale of all the real estate, a commission of 5 per cent was paid to designated real estate agents. Was that commission paid with respect to the sale of properties to the Veterans' Land Act?—A. Not only outside the V.L.A. deal. There was no commission paid on the VLA deal.

Q. Your general answer was rather inclusive?—A. I am sorry, outside the VLA deal.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. The figures you have supplied to the committee are the realization of the sale of real estate were gross figures, then?—A. Gross figures.

Q. From them should be deducted 5 per cent paid to agents?—A. Yes.

Q. Are there any other figures of any account which should be borne in mind in that respect?—A. No, I do not think so.

Q. We were just speaking about individual accounts and there is a statement which appears on page 57 of the report of Mr. Mathieu, to which reference might be made now to complete the picture. The summary of cash which has been collected from the realization of various assets and revenues has been as follows, and in the evacuee section the total is $5,373,317.64, while on the enemy section, that would be Japanese enemies I take it, $1,074,753.74, a total of $6,448,000. As I understand it, that is complete down to December 31, 1946. is that correct, Mr. Shears?—A. That is complete. Just what would you mean by complete there, Mr. Fleming?

Q. Is it a complete statement of the amounts realized through your office in Vancouver on the sale of property of Japanese persons of all kinds?—A. No, that is not strictly accurate. So far as the evacuee section is concerned, it is correct. The second column which deals with enemies includes accounts in the Vancouver ledgers covering persons who were interned. There were 700 of them at one time and they have now all been released. So far as the administration is concerned they are now being treated on the same basis as evacues. While they were in the internment camps we had separate ledgers. They were treated as enemies. This took care of the 700.

Then, there was a limited number of persons who were residents of Japan, living in Japan, but who had property in Vancouver. They were specifically enemies and their assets were included in this total. In addition to that, there was other Japanese property in the protected area belonging to Japanese persons or companies which were controlled by enemies and those properties have been administered by the appointment of controllers and liquidators. The figures for the realization of these assets do not all appear in this statement; that is to say, there have been other assets realized by the liquidator which have not yet come into the hands of the Custodian, but that would be directly in regard to Japanese

Q. In the case of these liquidators or controllers to which you refer— —A. That, as a matter of fact, is taken care of in the Price, Waterhouse audit which is attached to this report. It is the audited account of the enemy section of Vancouver office.

Q. Then, the liquidators and controllers report to your Vancouver office and not to Ottawa?—A. They are reporting to our office.

Q. What is the number of individual files open at this time?—A. The individual files which have cash balances at the end of last month, would be just about 1,500.

Q. Altogether?—A. That is all the accounts which have credit balances. The rest of the money has been paid out.

Q. In your Vancouver office, there are just 1,500 accounts?—A. I say 1,500 because I know specifically there were 1,780 two months ago and the number is being continuously reduced. There are about 1,500 accounts and the amount of money, at the present time, would be about $800,000.

Q. This represents a great diminution since the peak of three or four years ago?—A. Oh, definitely, yes.

Q. It is less than 10 per cent of your peak?—A. We have the files, of course. We have approximately 17,000 files, but not all of those files were concerned with assets which were realized.

Q. Have you any figures that you would like to refer to if you are trying to make up the difference?

Q. Well for instance, on page 50 of the report, "the number of evacuee accounts in our Vancouver ledger is as follows: December 31, 1944, 3,575; December 31, 1945, 3,820; December 31, 1946, 2,433."—A. Yes.

Q. I want to get your figure that compares now with that figure of 2,433 at December 31, 1946?—A. 1,500 or 1,600.

Q. So that you have made a reduction of one third in the last four months?—A. Yes, and the amount, instead of being $1,076,000 would be approximately $800,000 at the present time.

Q. Within what space of time do you expect to complete this liquidation?—A. I would say it could be completed this year.

Q. There were no other funds held for evacuees other than those which you have just mentioned now?—A. Not any funds. We have bonds to the extent of $250,000 belonging to individual evacuee accounts.

Q. This is simply a cash statement?—A. A cash statement.

Q. And you have bonds worth about a quarter of a million dollars?—A. Yes.

Q. What else remains?—A. Nothing at all except we have 25 unsold evacuee properties.

Q. You are down to 25 real estate properties, $250,000 in bonds, and $800,000 in cash?—A. Yes.

Q. That represents the complete inventory of the assets?—A. Yes, of evacuee assets on hand and there are those 25 association properties.

Q. Now are there any other properties or assets being administered through your Vancouver office for persons of the Japanese race that are not included in the evacuee section?—A. Apart from evacuees you mean?

Q. Yes.—A. There is about $250,000 in cash and $560,000 in bonds which is in the hands of the liquidators of enemy properties which have not been turned over to the custodian.

Q. That is all?—A. That is strictly enemy money and the final disposal of enemy assets I believe depends on the signing of the treaties of peace.

Q. You expect, in the ordinary course, that you will be complete this year; by the end of this calendar year?—A. Yes, the payment out of those funds on hand should be completed.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-49
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Q. You testified at an earlier day Mr. Shears that some of the Japanese had returned their cheques. They were not satisfied with the sale price and they returned their cheques. Now are the cheques that were returned included in the $800,000?—A. Yes, they are included in the $800,000 and those amounts are credited back to their accounts.

Q. Those accounts are just being carried as open accounts?—A. Yes.

Q. What is the total of that now?—A. I can only hazard a guess. There would not, however, be more than $4,000 or $5,000. They were relatively small amounts. In the 1,500 accounts of which I spoke I believe about 800 would be small amounts, of not much over $100 and the next group would be about 600 and they would involve around $1,000 each, and there would not be more than 100 evacuee accounts whose balances would run over $1,000.

Q. When you close out an account do you make any attempt to obtain a release from the person entitled to the proceeds?—A. It has been our usual practice when closing out Japanese accounts to send him his final balance indicating to him that this was all the money that was being held by the custodian and we ask him to acknowledge its correctness. Sometimes they did acknowledge its correctness. Sometimes they did acknowledge and sometimes they did not but they were given a statement of their account.

Q. How ample is the statement given? Can you file a sample copy?—A. I have not one here but it would be this. There would be a credit for the net sale of his property and there would be auction sales credit from a certain auction and a credit from another auction and so on. This Japanese may have been receiving $50 a month, every month, and there would be a debit of that $50. It would be an itemized statement and of course it would be possible for him to come back and ask for more information.

Q. In respect to the credit item from the sale of his property and the details of that, would you just have given him the gross figure?—A. The statement would have a record of what the property was sold for and the charges against it.

Q. In what proportions did the Japanese sign the release which was sent indicating the correctness of the account?—A. We did not make any estimate but they were asked to acknowledge the cheque. Sometimes they came back and acknowledged it in full settlement and in other cases they avoided the issue and we did not press it further.

Q. You are not prepared to make any estimate of the proportion?—A. No.

Mr. Cote: Did I understand you to say Mr. Shears that you included in the statement a special release form which you asked the Japanese to sign and return?

The Witness: No, there was no particular form but in our letter we indicated this was the balance to his credit and that everything had been sold and we asked him to acknowledge that he was satisfied.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be monopolizing the time of the committee and if any one wants to interrupt me at any time I would ask that they please do so.

Mr. Cruickshank: Mr. Fleming asked some questions regarding the sale of the land in the Fraser Valley en bloc to the Veterans' Land Act and he asked whether anybody else was requested to tender or whether individual sales had been asked for. I would just like to ask Mr. Shears if it is true that this land was not in general demand at the time that the sale to the Veteran's Land Act took place? Is that true? Is that the information you had?

The Witness: I could not say. We had no specific information as at that time the custodian's office was not offering any properties for sale.

Mr. Cruickshank: Just to make the point clear my information is that small berry farms were not in demand at the time this sale was made to the Veterans' Land Act.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-50
www.nikkeimuseum.org

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. I just want to clear up a point or two and I want to make good my promise to the committee that I will finish this morning. Dealing with the matter of employees in the office, Mr. Shears, on page 51 of the report you give figures as to the numbers in the office at the end of the various years. At the end of 1943 there were 93; at the end of 1944 there were 70; at the end of 1945 there were 49; and at the end of 1946 there were 30.

What would the figure be to-day?—A. It is 28 and, as a matter of fact, I do not think there will be much change until the final winding up. We now have 11 men and 17 girls.

Q. Now I turn to the matter of the fishing vessels. There were only 1,000 of those which were taken over by the Japanese fishing vessels advisory committee and most of them were sold by them but 180 were eventually turned over to the custodian?—A. Yes.

Q. My question is of a rather different nature from what we have had. If you have not all the information perhaps Mr. Wright can supplement your answer. Was there anything found in those fishing vessels of any nature which reflected on the activities of persons of the Japanese race as far as the security of Canada is concerned?—A. The vessels were of course seized by the navy and they did not come into the possession of the custodian until some months afterward. 950 had been sold and 170 came into the hands of the custodian. As far as evidence that came from the vessels directly to the custodian I would say there was none.

Q. You have not any personal knowledge of anything that reflected possible activities against the security of Canada?—A. No, I would not care to say so. All I can say was that on one occasion there came into our possession a map, probably about the size of this table, written in Japanese, and it appeared to be quite a detailed chart of the coast. That was forwarded to Ottawa to the security department. That is the only particular incident that I recall. Mr. Wright was there in charge at the time.

Mr. Cruickshank: May I interrupt a moment? My understanding is that we are not here, and if I am wrong I will be corrected; but my understanding is we are not here to discover whether any Japanese was loyal or disloyal. We are here to see that the Japanese get a fair deal under British fair play. I do not think the matter of loyalty or disloyalty enters into our terms of reference.

Mr. Cote: My own opinion is, Mr. Cruickshank, that you are misunderstanding the point raised by Mr. Fleming. This, I think, comes under our terms. If there was anything found in those vessels that was entrusted to the custodian for disposal I think we should know. Mr. Fleming is just enquiring whether among those assets there were any things present which reflected upon the loyalty of the owners.

Mr. Cruickshank: I still do not think it has anything to do with this. I have two lawyers against me but my understanding is that we are here to find out, and I think my friends from the prairies will support me, whether the Japanese were fully paid and as far as the British Columbia members are concerned, and myself, in particular, that is the issue. We threshed that out down on the floor of the House and I do not think it has anything to do with it. We are here just to see if the Japanese has been paid a sufficient price for the chattels and boats and farms and anything else. I certainly do not think this committee should discuss at this time whether any Japanese was loyal or disloyal. I still think that in spite of the legal opinions from the two central provinces.

The Acting Chairman: I think the question was given quite a complete answer.

Mr. FLEMING: The reference was made by Mr. Wright and I wonder if Mr. Wright could add anything to this now. It is in connection with properties that came into the possession of the custodian.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: If an atomic bomb was found among those boats is it of any value to us?

Mr. FLEMING: I would think it would be of a great deal of value. Can Mr. Wright add anything to the answer?

Mr. WRIGHT: As Mr. Shears has said, all these vessels were taken over by the navy. There have been statements made from time to time that equipment other than fishing equipment was found but this equipment did not come into the hands of the custodian. We had no personal knowledge of those things. We have had information from fishermen and a number of others who were coming into the office. As a matter of fact the custodian was charged with the responsibility of administering the assets and security was left to the R.C.M.P. We did get information, however, from time to time which, if it was considered to be of use to the R.C.M.P., was turned over to them. Actually we had no personal knowledge of any equipment being found in boats because those boats were taken over by the navy.

Mr. FLEMING: I would simply put the question this way. Have you or have you not information that property which came into the hands of the custodian, from or through persons of the Japanese race, reflected or suggested activities detrimental to the security of Canada on the part of such persons?

Mr. WRIGHT: I do not recall any such equipment coming into the hands of the custodian. Of course radios were taken over by the R.C.M.P. and afterwards they came into our possession. Firearms were taken from the Japanese, turned over to the R.C.M.P. and their cameras were seized by the R.C.M.P.

Mr. FLEMING: Your answer would be that nothing of that kind came into the hands of the custodian but it did go into the hands of the R.C.M.P.

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Well, I want to follow you up there. All these boats and equipment were seized immediately after Pearl Harbour.

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: In your opinion, as a responsible Canadian citizen, is it not reasonable to surmise that if an atomic bomb or any other weapons had been on those boats they would have been immediately dumped overboard? In your opinion is that not a reasonable supposition? Mr. Chairman, I think this has just as much relevancy as Mr. Fleming's questions. He is bringing up the question of whether the Japanese was loyal or disloyal. Is it not reasonable to assume that if a Japanese had several machine guns in a fishing boat that after Pearl Harbour, knowing his boat was to be seized by the R.C.M.P. he would have dumped that stuff overboard?

It is good reasoning in British Columbia but apparently it is not good reasoning in Ontario.

Mr. STEWART: Did he know his boat was to be seized?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Yes, of course he did.

Mr. FLEMING: If the witness would go on—

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Now, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Fleming is trying to put this matter aside. These gentlemen, in my opinion, should answer the question. The seizing of property was not done by the custodian, it was done by the Mounted Police. I asked this question and I want it on the record and I want an answer from the two witnesses. Is it not reasonable to surmise the Japanese [illegible] immediately after Pearl Harbour?

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-51
www.nikkeimuseum.org

The Acting CHAIRMAN: Mr. Cruickshank is perfectly entitled to make his supposition and the witness is there to answer.

Mr. FLEMING: I will agree entirely with Mr. Cruickshank. I think it would have been a perfectly reasonable thing to do.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Well that is all right then.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. I think it would have been a very reasonable thing to expect. Did it come within the scope of the custodian's office in Vancouver to know of the departure of persons of the Japanese race from Canada in the period leading up to Pearl Harbour? In the custodian's search for Japanese assets did he have occasion to enquire into the departure of persons of the Japanese race in the weeks or months leading up to Pearl Harbour?

Mr. WRIGHT: All the information I can give you is that about the middle of July 1943, and the information is in a report here, a number of persons of the Japanese race left to go back to Japan.

Mr. FLEMING: Have you any information as to the number?

Mr. WRIGHT: As to the number of Japanese properties?

Mr. FLEMING: No, the number of Japanese who left this country in the weeks immediately preceding Pearl Harbour?

Mr. WRIGHT: There was some information in a report that was submitted by the B.C. security commission and if you will give me a moment I just might find it for you. The custodian had no information except that contained in this report.

Mr. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to have two things cleared up in my mind. We are trying to let Mr. Shears away today. Will the audit of the custodian's department in Vancouver be put in the hands of the committee as soon as it is prepared.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: That is what I gathered from yesterday's evidence of Mr. Shears.

Doctor COLEMAN: If I might interrupt, I think I can answer a little more authoritatively than Mr. Shears. On behalf of the office of the secretary of state I give you our unreserved promise that the committee will receive, before it ends its deliberations, the full report.

Mr. STEWART: The second thing is that, in spite of the fact Mr. Shears is going, we will still get the reports.

Doctor COLEMAN: Mr. Shears is not going. He has decided to stay until this thing is through.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: I will leave it in the hands of the committee to decide when we should sit again.

Mr. COTE: Is there any reply coming from Mr. Wright?

Mr. WRIGHT: I will get the information out of this report.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: It is now after 1.00 o'clock and I think it would be in order to adjourn at this time. We will adjourn at the call of the chair.

The meeting adjourned at 1.05 p.m. to meet again at the call of the chair.

APPENDIX "A"

ORIGINAL OFFER OF THE DIRECTOR, THE VETERANS' LAND ACT, FOR THE PURCHASE OF 769 PARCELS OF FARM LANDS FROM THE CUSTODIAN OF ENEMY PROPERTY

File No.	J.L.	Name	Appraisal	Sale Price	Increased	Withdrawn
			$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts
2862	92	Adachi, A.	988 00	970 00		
5058	93	Adachi, M. K.	1,222 00	1,222 00		
5442	178	Amemori, A.	855 00	839 00		
5432	85	Araki, T.	850 00	834 00		
9363	110	Endo, H.	419 00	411 00		
9363/4	111	Endo, T. and H.	2,038 00	2,001 00		
2864	116	Fukami, K.	1,400 00	1,374 00		
2864	116	Fukami, K.	225 00	221 00		
2851	172	Fukami, K. M.	424 00	416 00		
11060	75	Fukawa, S.	1,158 00	1,137 00		
5573	31	Fujino, K.	2,085 00	2,047 00		
5573	31	Fujino, K.	125 00	123 00		
Ist. 132	87	Hirai, S.	323 00	317 00		x
2853	89	Hashimoto, R.	1,560 00	1,532 00		
4999	82	Hayashi, G.	550 00	540 00		
6620	33	Hayashi, K.	977 00	959 00		
5438	143	Hashizume, E.	570 00	560 00		
5438	143	Hashizume, E.	2,326 00	2,284 00		
5438	143	Hashizume, E.	120 00	118 00		
5438	143	Hashizume, E.	1,795 00	1,763 00		
4965	18	Hinatsu, Y.	1,488 00	1,461 00		
4461	46	Hisaoka, I.	250 00	245 00		
4461	46	Hisaoka, I.	1,351 00	1,327 00		
5437	94	Ikebuchi, T.	1,450 00	1,424 00		
5444	50	Inouye, Y.	755 00	741 00		
6622	146	Ito, D.	2,000 00	1,964 00		x
4612	84	Kadoyama, I.	770 00	756 00		
13862	171	Kadonaga, T.	731 00	718 00		
9937	112	Kamimura, K.	279 00	274 00		
2859	117	Kato, K.	887 00	871 00		
5439	19	Kitagawa, Y.	850 00	835 00		x
5440	27	Konno, Y.	769 00	755 00		
5440	27	Konno, Y.	214 00	210 00		
5574	118	Nagata, F.	500 00	491 00		
6618	118	Kudo, M.	668 00	656 00		
5424	141	Kunimoto, S.	623 00	612 00		
5424	141	Kunimoto, S.	1,835 00	1,802 00		
2525	20	Mitsunaga, T.	610 00	599 00		
2861 5441	32	Moriyama, T. Miyagawa, H.	280 00	275 00		
5428	24	Miyagawa, T.	1,000 00	982 00		
4741	107	Mori, Y.	2,179 00	2,140 00		
4742	108	Mori, Y.	512 00	503 00		
2861	17	Moriyama, T.	500 00	491 00		
12875	17	Moriyama, M.	890 00	874 00		
2861	17	Moriyama, T.	79 00	78 00		x
15607	120	Nakamura, H.	1,300 00	1,276 00		x
5419	408	Nakashima, T.	820 00	805 00		
2865	2	Nishiyama, K.	2,386 00	2,343 00		
5430	196	Nomura, Y.	1,216 00	1,194 00		
2883	77	Ogawa, K.	970 00	952 00		
1352	49	Oda, K.	1,265 00	1,242 00		
10220	3	Ohashi, S.	4,526 00	4,444 00		
10220	3	Ohashi, S.	449 00	441 00		
10220	3	Ohashi, S.	297 00	292 00		
5435	90	Okabe, D.	2,100 00	2,062 00		
5435	90	Okabe, D.	96 00	94 00		
5575	489	Okamura, M.	453 00	445 00		x
5445	1	Okuma, Y.	2,677 00	2,628 00		
9332	113	Onisaki, S.	328 00	322 00		
5443	45	Ohno, K.	974 00	956 00		
9331	30	Saito, K.	1,600 00	1,571 00		
2867 2705	86	Saito, K. Mrs. Shizu Saito	1,000 00	982 00		
12227	220	Sakon, B.	4,229 00	4,152 00		
4601	80	Sakon, M.	1,796 00	1,764 00		
4601	80	Sakon, M.	424 00	416 00		

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-52
www.nikkeimuseum.org

File No.	J.L.	Name	Appraisal	Sale Price	Increased	Withdrawn
			$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	
13282 / 13287	91	Sakon, M. / Sakon, I.	514 00	505 00		
4616	142	Sasaki, C.	763 00	749 00		
5425	28	Sato, S.	715 00	702 00		
5578	135	Senda, K.	1,775 00	1,743 00		
9236	23	Oikawa, M. N.	1,622 00	1,593 00		
2873	26	Shimomura, T.	1,190 00	1,168 00		
3265	129	Shimoda, K.	775 00	761 00		
5434 / 3265 / 2525	76	Uyemura, I. / Shimoda, K. / Mitsunaga, T.	492 00	483 00		
Int. 1248	64	Shiono, N. (In Trust)	577 00	567 00		
Int. 713	121	Shirakawa, T.	450 00	442 00		x
Int. 713	121	Shirakawa, T.	1,422 00	1,396 00		x
Int. 1111	34	Towomura, M.	600 00	589 00		
Int. 1111	48	Towomura, M.	539 00	529 00		
13693	78	Tashiro, G.	1,600 00	1,571 00		x
2875	79	Tashiro, E.	499 00	490 00		
5579	21	Tatebe, K.	1,100 00	1,080 00		
5579	22	Tatebe, K.	760 00	746 00		
Int. 1113	114	Tateyama, S.	565 00	555 00		
5576	25	Tsuji, K.	800 00	786 00	402 60	
4962 / 5581	51	Tsuji, T. / Tsuji, S.	460 00	452 00		x
9320	136	Umetsu, K. (In Trust)	1,861 00	1,827 00		
5434	47	Uyemura, I.	1,325 00	1,301 00		
5434	47	Uyemura, I.	260 00	255 00		
3267	88	Watanabe, Y.	1,200 00	1,178 00		
3267	88	Watanabe, Y.	235 00	231 00		
2881	83	Yako, T.	360 00	353 00		
5421	29	Yanoshita, T.	1,850 00	1,817 00	278 00	
5421	29	Yanoshita, T.	555 00	545 00		x
Int. 736	181	Aoki, C.	195 00	191 00		
5060	184	Aoki, K.	885 00	869 00		
5060	184	Aoki, K.	188 00	185 00		
2857	145	Hattori, S.	1,377 00	1,352 00		x
2855	145	Hattori, M.	110 00	108 00		
5433	173	Hayashi, T.	793 00	779 00	353 00	
6620	33	Hayashi, K.	368 00	361 00		x
5437	94	Ikebuchi, T.	615 00	604 00		
1572	198	Ito, Y.	850 00	835 00		
4529	169	Kimura, I.	1,420 00	1,394 00		
2889	170	Kinoshita, A.	880 00	864 00		
4963	119	Kodama, T.	880 00	864 00		
4960	177	Matsushita, J.	91 00	89 00		
5441	179	Miyagawa, H.	340 00	334 00		
5426	182	Nakashima, U.	2,190 00	2,150 00		
2287	183	Okamura, S.	299 00	294 00		
5445	1	Okuma, Y.	240 00	236 00		
5425	174	Sato, S.	130 00	128 00		
2871	144	Shigehiro, K.	1,151 00	1,130 00		
5420	23	Shikaze, K.	1,875 00	1,841 00		x
5420	23	Shikaze, K.	552 00	542 00		
13222	168	Takamoto, S.	225 00	221 00		
2879	180	Yahiro, Kin.	1,785 00	1,753 00	288 00	
11525	7	Abe, M.	1,831 00	1,798 00		
7008	217	Aomoto, I.	1,885 00	1,851 00		
8654	53	Arinobu, H.	612 00	601 00		x
5993	56	Arinobu, M.	1,593 00	1,564 00		
2763 / 5992	164	Ariza, F. / Ariza, M.	1,509 00	1,482 00		
12585	153	Fujii, Y.	1,218 00	1,196 00		
5318 / 5831 / Int. 1263	391	Fujita, H. / Nakano, R. / Iwato, S.	2,808 00	2,757 00		
5284 / 6399	188	Otani, K. / Otani, Y.	729 00	716 00		
2761	195	Fujita, Y.	1,094 00	1,074 00		
5069	374	Fujino, S.	1,537 00	1,509 00		
5401	63	Fujishige, T.	1,155 00	1,134 00		x
3308	349	Fujiwara, T.	264 00	259 00		
7348	13	Fukuda, T.	1,000 00	982 00		x
3325	375	Fukunaga, S.	25 00	25 00		x
Int. 131	148	Furuya, M. & Co. Ltd.	521 00	512 00		x
5431	6	Furukawa, G.	1,400 00	1,375 00		
5431	6	Furukawa, G.	731 00	718 00		

File No.	J.L.	Name	Appraisal	Sale Price	Increased	Withdrawn
			$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	
7346	12	Furukawa, K.	1,700 00	1,669 00		
4230	98	Furuse, K.	170 00	167 00		
2281	313	Go, T.	257 00	252 00		x
4820	321	Goryo, Y.	531 00	522 00		
2860	16	Goto, G.	654 00	642 00		
7376	61	Gyotoku, U.	1,127 00	1,106 00		
6930	151	Hamaura, S.	47 00	46 00		
6930	151	Hamaura, S.	96 00	94 00		
6930	151	Hamaura, S.	202 00	198 00		
Int. 564	128	Hara, K.	836 00	821 00		x
6659	106	Hayami, M.	1,147 00	1,126 00		
9374 / 767	156	Hidaka, T. / Hidaka, K.	292 00	287 00		
4620	288	Hiramatsu, T.	203 00	199 00		
7000 / 7001	213	Hirowatari, H. / Hirowatari, T.	1,680 00 / 1,680 00	1,650 00 / 1,650 00		
4833	211	Hisanaga, M.	924 00	907 00		
4846	192	Hisanaga, M.	150 00	147 00		
Int. 162 / 8794	361	Hori, G. / Hori, S.	350 00	344 00		
8662	150	Horiuchi, Y.	878 00	862 00		
5403	105	Hosaki, S.	3,170 00	3,113 00		
5403	137	Hosaki, S.	285 00	280 00		
5403	137	Hosaki, S.	744 00	731 00		
7352 / Int. 1437 / Int. 1302	54	Hoyano, T. / Yamasaki, K. / Okasaki, I.	940 00	923 00		
7353	682	Hoyaho (Mrs.) Y.	3,635 00	3,569 00		
Int. 402	683	Ichikawa, H.	2,760 00	2,710 00		
6988	314	Ikeda, K.	1,986 00	1,950 00		
6996	216	Imada, K.	3,038 00	2,983 00		
6933 / 6929 / 7378	345	Imada, T. / Imada, K. / Imada, T.	392 00	385 00		
6995	254	Imada, Y.	1,350 00	1,326 00		
8823	366	Iinuma, T.	252 00	248 00		
9379	390	Inouye, Y.	Nil	Nil		x
6990	309	Isoshima, T.	866 00	850 00		
6983	310	Isoshima, Y.	2,269 00	2,228 00		
3413	376	Itaya, W.	501 00	492 00		
736	358	Iwamoto, T.	366 00	359 00		
3415	359	Iwamoto, S.	771 00	757 00		
7349	35	Iwase, T.	1,305 90	1,281 00		
8059 / 13606	289	Kajuira, H. / Kajuira, D.	1,660 00	1,630 00		
12273	684	Kanzaki, T.	3,728 00	3,661 00		
8791 / 14172	342	Kato, K. / Sato, S.	49 00	48 00		
8796	353	Kato, S.	552 00	542 00		
8667	149	Katsuno, C.	1,870 00	1,836 00		
5281	187	Kawashima, A.	627 00	616 00		
7342	194	Kawamoto, M.	270 00	265 00		
8670	68	Kawamoto, S.	1,770 00	1,738 00		
9386	154	Kido, K.	1,000 00	982 00		
4981	127	Kido, S.	1,196 00	1,174 00		
11970	138	Kika, T.	504 00	495 00		x
8790	350	Kobayashi, K.	281 00	276 00		
2759	175	Koga, S.	1,516 00	1,489 90		
2885	166	Koga, T.	1,434 00	1,408 00		
8272	246	Kobara, C.	684 00	672 00		
8308 / 8673	279	Kohy, T. Mrs. / Kohy, Y.	1,558 00	1,530 00		
5283	263	Kojima, I.	1,571 00	1,543 00		
6981 / 6980 / 6982	176	Kosaka, J. / Kosaka, T. / Kosaka, M.	3,145 00	3,088 00		
3425 / 2024	348	Kosaka, K. / Kosaka, M.	496 00	487 00		
6994 / 6987	176	Kosaka, M. / Kosaka, K.	418 00	410 00		
7362 / 9351	73	Kumamoto, H. / Kumamoto, T.	1,482 00	1,455 00		
7361 / 7360	74	Kumamoto, K. / Kumamoto, T.	701 00	688 00		
9587	55	Kusano, K.	430 00	422 00		

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-53
www.nikkeimuseum.org

File No.	J.L.	Name	Appraisal	Sale Price	Increased	Withdrawn
			$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	
9587	55	Kusano, K.	2,241 00	2,200 00		x
9588	161	Maehara, K.	500 00	491 00		
4652	162	Maehara, M.	1,110 00	1,090 00		
7004	287	Makino, M.	1,300 00	1,276 00		
5282	285	Matsume, T.	1,100 00	1,080 00		
2001 / 2033	199	Matsuo, K. / Matsuo, S.	755 00	741 00		
8674	209	Matsuoka, T.	1,443 00	1,417 00		
8677	686	Miyasaki, M.	3,345 00	3,284 00		
5285	261	Matsunie, I.	484 00	475 00		
5402	284	Matsumoto, Y.	419 00	411 00		
7350	36	Mende, S.	131 00	129 00		
3445	346	Miki, Y.	939 00	922 00		
4836	270	Mishima, T.	1,000 00	982 00		
4831 / 4830	264	Miyake, T. / Miyake, N.	402 00	395 00		
2757	210	Mitani, H.	997 00	979 00		
3401 / 3403	320	Miyanaga, Y. / Miyanaga, Mrs. K.	765 00	751 00		
8707	130	Morishige, F.	503 00	494 00		
3360	130	Nishikawa, S.	722 00	709 00		
6986	290	Mochizuki, N.	2,258 00	2,217 00		
6984	286	Mochizuki, S.	2,074 00	2,036 00		
7366	248	Morikawa, K.	3,156 00	3,099 00		
8680 / 8682	193	Morikawa, M. / Morikawa, F.	1,577 00	1,548 00		
7351	42	Mukai, O.	2,384 00	2,341 00		
7351	42	Mukai, O.	590 00	579 00		
3409	354	Mukaida, K.	2,558 00	2,512 00		
3409	354	Mukaida, K.	237 00	233 00		
7375	71	Mukuda, N.	894 00	878 00		x
Int. 201	363	Naheta, M.	212 00	208 00		
4796 / 4832	157	Nabuto, F. Mrs. / Nabuto, K.	466 00	458 00		x
6977 / 6972	307	Yoshihara, I. / Yoshihara, R.	1,000 00	982 00		
12001	256	Nagao, M.	1,728 00	1,697 00		
7354	69	Nakahara, H.	2,405 00	2,362 00		
6928 / 13467	322	Nakamura, M. / Nakamura, H.	2,187 00	2,147 00		
7367	66	Nakano, A.	1,000 00	982 00		
7308	122	Nakano, A.	818 00	803 00		
5975	43	Nakano, J.	2,913 00	2,560 00		
5974	43	Nakano, J.	Included above	300 00		
7377	57	Nakano, S.	770 00	756 00		
7364	67	Nakano, Y.	1,249 00	1,226 00		
7372	41	Nakata, Y.	572 00	562 00		
10457 / 13949	281	Namba, A. / Namba, S.	2,482 00	2,437 00		
1927	274	Namba, M.	207 00	203 00		
5821	343	Nikaido, M.	644 00	632 00		
8047	352	Natsuhara, K.	2,363 00	2,320 00		
3955	65	Nishimoto, K.	250 00	246 00		
2839 / 2843	247	Odaguchi, F. / Odaguchi, E.	598 00	587 00		
8685	318	Odamura, T.	2,955 00	2,902 00		
8689	277	Odamura, T.	47 00	46 00		
8687 / 8688	317	Odamura, T. / Odamura, N.	304 00	299 00		
5230	367	Ogawa, S.	53 00	52 00		
8802	341	Ogawa, Y.	1,343 00	1,319 00		
5972 / 8676	308	Ohta, Y. / Miyamota, S.	1,050 00	1,031 00		
8695	39	Oike, K.	3,454 00	3,392 00		
4837	242	Oka, S.	1,300 00	1,276 00		
4838 / 4841	283	Oka, T. / Oka, M.	1,900 00	1,866 00		
5005	11	Okabe, K.	1,139 00	1,118 00		
8692 / 8666	305	Okada, T. / Karatsu, N.	1,051 00	1,032 00		
4222	95	Okahashi, M.	133 00	131 00		x
2837	186	Okano, K.	2,404 00	2,360 00		
5278	255	Okano, M.	210 00	206 00		
6974 / 6970	243	Oki, H. / Oki, T.	1,579 00	1,551 00		

File No.	J.L.	Name	Appraisal	Sale Price	Increased	Withdrawn
			$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	
6970	219	Oki, T.	48 00	47 00		
4080	357	Okubo, F.	947 00	930 00		
8699	4	Omura, S.	600 00	589 00		
8698	5	Omura, S.	3,010 00	2,955 00		
2835	163	Onagi, K.	750 00	736 00		
9214	115	Mori, H. Mrs. (formerly Ooto)	330 00	324 00		
2543	212	Osuto, S.	1,812 00	1,779 00		
4835	100	Oxamoto, M.	995 00	977 00		
6991	316	Ryoji, K.	1,405 00	1,380 00		
10105	103	Sakaki, T.	100 00	98 00		
7359	59	Sakamoto, M.	268 00	263 00		
7374	58	Sano, S.	2,145 00	2,106 00		
3419	460	Sawada, T.	986 00	968 00		
7360	10	Sawayama, G.	847 00	832 00		
Int. 879	304	Seko, S.	1,324 00	1,300 00		
6989	214	Seo, M.	363 00	356 00		
2887	38	Seto, M.	1,415 00	1,389 00		
3370	362	Shigemi, T.	901 00	885 00		
2797	159	Shimizu, J.	2,028 00	1,991 00		
11297	129	Shimoda, K.	507 00	498 00		x
8815	351	Shimizu, R.	276 00	271 00		
8703	258	Shimoji, S.	918 00	901 00		
9327	276	Shimoji, K.	900 00	884 00		
9401	123	Shin, S. Z.	1,861 00	1,827 00	227 00	
9402	311	Shin, Y.	752 00	738 00		
6993	282	Shishido, E.	1,000 00	982 00		
3417	360	Shono, K.	699 00	686 00		
12276	365	Shoji, G. Y.	1,305 00	1,281 00	123 28	
Int. 1347	147	Sunada, T.	96 00	95 00		
6161 / 8706	280	Tada, G. / Tada, T.	505 00	496 00		
5453	378	Tahara, R.	1,260 00	1,237 00		
1496	415	Tahara, T.	102 00	100 00		
11617	185	Takagi, D.	525 00	516 00		
4971	40	Takahashi, R. K.	1,116 00	1,096 00	84 00	
8710	275	Takasaki, S.	1,200 00	1,178 00		
8710	275	Takasaki, S.	260 00	255 00		
7357	15	Takashima, T.	1,300 00	1,277 00		
8003	60	Takashima, Y.	240 00	236 00		
6409	70	Takashita, T.	2,184 00	2,145 00		
9612	134	Takeuchi, M.	468 00	460 00		
9410	133	Takeuchi, Y.	833 00	818 00		
9405	155	Takiguchi, H. (Mrs.)	495 00	486 00		
9405	126	Takiguchi, H.	179 00	176 00		
8714	101	Takimoto, Y.	Nil	Nil		x
6661	158	Kakumasu, S.	274 00	269 00		
6968	215	Tamura, J.	2,161 00	2,122 00		
5280 / 5316	224	Tamura, M. / Tamura, Y.	2,130 00	2,091 00		
5279 / 5286	72	Tamura, M. / Tamura, T.	676 00	664 00		
4840	273	Tanaka, S.	750 00	736 00		
4840	273	Tanaka, S.	522 00	513 00		x
4840	273	Tanaka, S.	1,797 00	1,765 00		
4844	272	Tanaka, Y.	1,125 00	1,105 00		
4845	271	Tanaka, M.	196 00	192 00		
5287	262	Taniguchi, R.	2,572 00	2,525 00		
5287	262	Taniguchi, R.	96 00	94 00		
6978	241	Tateishie, T.	295 00	290 00		
5958	52	Tazumi, A.	1,200 00	1,178 00		
5958	52	Tazumi, A.	175 00	172 00		
2925	379	Tokuyasu, Y.	388 00	381 00		
4220	102	Teramura, N.	930 00	913 00		
2852	152	Tomita, M.	1,012 00	994 00		
3399 / 3411	131	Ikeda, Y. / Tsujita, T.	488 00	479 00		
3411	344	Tsujita, T.	605 00	594 00		
13554	37	Tsujiura, T.	336 00	330 00		x
9321	160	Tusuyuki, I.	434 00	426 00		
9621	132	Uchimaru, I.	1,219 00	1,197 00		
4821	323	Uchimaru, K.	174 00	171 00		
9416 / Int. 1414	347	Unetsu, K. / Unetsu, T.	1,088 00	1,068 00		x
4842	189	Urn, I.	1,265 00	1,242 00		
4839	206	Utsonomiyn, G.	1,750 00	1,718 00		
Int. 368	124	Uyeno, H.	563 00	553 00		
3366	380	Wada, K.	293 00	288 00		

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-54
www.nikkeimuseum.org

File No.	J.L.	Name	Appraisal	Sale Price	Increased	Withdrawn
			$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	
4823	392	Wakahara, S	1,580 00	1,551 00		
13057	97	Wakayama, K	2,726 00	2,677 00		
5451	364	Yakushiro, T	1,514 00	1,487 00		
5451 / 3405	356	Yakushiro, T / Taniguchi, K	1,222 00	1,200 00		
6660	253	Yamaga, Y	1,614 00	1,585 00		
7371	44	Yamamoto, K	50 00	49 00		
7371	44	Yamamoto, K	50 00	49 00		
7370	62	Yamamoto, R	1,416 00	1,390 00		
11243	207	Yamamoto, T. now Taku, T	685 00	673 00		
8716	278	Yamamoto, U	2,080 00	2,042 00		
8717	139	Yamasaki, N	590 00	579 00		
6992 / 12228	315	Yamasaki, G / Yoshizaki, Y	738 00	725 00		
6663 / 6664	165	Yokoyama, A / Yokoyama, T	1,028 00	1,009 00		
6662	218	Yokoyama, T	755 00	741 00		
6976	291	Yoneyama, R	1,420 00	1,394 00		
8719	312	Yoshida, G	978 00	960 00		
8721	208	Yoshida, M	2,765 00	2,715 00		
5288	190	Yoshida, Y	1,681 00	1,651 00		
6975	104	Yoshida, E	1,925 00	1,890 00		
6972	691	Yoshihara, R	3,689 00	3,622 00		
7383	99	Yoshikawa, S	1,550 00	1,522 00		
Int. 1357	257	Yoshino, K	1,705 00	1,674 00		
10660	9	Yoshioka, A	1,822 00	1,789 00		
7373	8	Yoshioka, K	1,376 00	1,351 00		
376	231	Aratake, S	943 00	926 00		
5095	228	Adachi, Y	431 00	423 00		
5094	205	Amano, S	475 00	466 00		
9304	109	Endo, T	1,081 00	1,061 00		
3941	244	Eto, S	2,887 00	2,835 00		
5989	227	Fugikawa, S	1,255 00	1,232 00		
5990	202	Fugikawa, G	980 00	962 00		
6685	206	Handa, M	78 00	76 00		
5088	743	Haraga, M	1,246 00	1,223 00		
4965	18	Hinatsu, Y	870 00	854 00		
5977	191	Morizaki, F	1,694 00	1,663 00		
13930	678	Imamura, K	1,009 00	991 00		
13930	678	Imamura, K	1,649 00	1,619 00		
4988	295	Imamura, K	389 00	382 00		
4498	293	Inouye, S	840 00	825 00		
4618	112	Kamimura, K	1,379 00	1,354 00		
4528	301	Katsura, S	1,251 00	1,228 00		
5983	340	Kawana, Y	2,094 00	2,056 00		
Int. 305	234	Kinoshita, M	485 00	476 00		
4619	200	Kodama, S	2,114 00	2,076 00		
13387	265	Kunimoto, S	1,639 00	1,609 00		
5981	245	Kusano, A	1,653 00	1,623 00		
8052 / 3961	252	Maruyama, S / Maruyama, S	726 00	713 00		
4530	260	Masuda, S	797 00	783 00		
5979	221	Matsui, K	1,385 00	1,360 00		
6624	203	Matsumoto, S	340 00	334 00		
8675	238	Matsuoka, H	738 00	725 00		
4524	679	Miki, M	2,555 00	2,509 00		
3945	251	Mimura, T. J	656 00	644 00		
4506	225	Miyasaki, S	2,255 00	2,214 00		
7365	248	Morikawa, K	908 00	980 00		
4990	294	Morikawa, T	1,007 00	989 00		
5976	233	Murakami, H	450 00	442 00		
3957	298	Nakamura, S	1,250 00	1,227 00		
3955	65	Nishimoto, K	2,942 00	2,889 00		
4512	267	Noda, G	192 00	189 00		
4512	267	Noda, G	1,075 00	1,065 00		
4496 / Int. 1268	237	Ogata, K / Nakagawa, G	2,224 00	2,184 00		x
4226	239	Oka, U. (Mrs.)	488 00	479 00		
7832	250	Orida, I	620 00	609 00		
3949	249	Orida, M	663 00	651 00		
4991	300	Oye, C	2,100 00	2,062 00		
9310	260	Saito, T	792 00	778 00		
5577	222	Sameshima, M	1,892 00	1,858 00		
5964	223	Sasaki, R	3,278 00	3,219 00		
7038	174	Sato, S	1,555 00	1,527 00		
5184	204	Shikaze, Y	390 00	382 00		
5436	204	Shikaze, Y	292 00	287 00		
Int. 713 / 4602	121	Shirakawa, T / Inaba, M	1,826 00	1,793 00		x
5964	230	Sugiyama, K	1,849 00	1,816 00		
4653	302	Tahara, S	726 00	713 00		
4500	303	Taise, H	812 00	797 00		x
5331	292	Tajiri, K	475 00	466 00		
8708	201	Takake, K	610 00	600 00		
7040	324	Tanaka, T	456 00	448 00		
4504	319	Taniyama, S	921 00	940 00		
14885 / 3941 / 5000	226	Tateishi, I. (Dec'd) / Eto, S / Okabe, T	672 00	660 00		x
13386	259	Tsutsumi, H	2,067 00	2,030 00		
4502	299	Tsutsumi, M	1,226 00	1,204 00		
14041	296	Yamada, S	2,370 00	2,327 00		
13385	240	Yamamoto, I	1,340 00	1,316 00		
5044	268	Yamamoto, K	800 00	785 00		
13142	235	Yamamoto, S	1,795 00	1,762 00		
5582	232	Yanoshita, S	470 00	461 00		
5953	229	Yasumatsu, K	2,453 00	2,409 00		
Int. 725	297	Yonemitsu, K (In U.S.A.)	1,555 00	1,527 00		
3965	371	Abo, K	735 00	722 00		
8052	333	Akaye, K	161 00	158 00		x
3333	335	Chiba, K	245 00	241 00		
8653	394	Eto, B	1,136,00	1,115 00		
3967	370	Eto, K	1,732 00	1,701 00		
3967	370	Eto, K	453 00	455 00		
6642	332	Fujimoto, M	1,659 00	1,629 00		
Int. 1276 / 7384	336	Ishikawa, J / Ishikawa, I	200 00	196 00		
8646	327	Kinoshita, S	1,483 00	1,456 00		
3923	328	Fukumoto, K	1,290 00	1,267 00		
10225	330	Kamachi, O	1,000 00	982 00		
3959	334	Kinoshita, K	1,263 00	1,240 00		
3959	334	Kinoshita, K	50 00	49 00		x
13004	326	Kinoshita, K	465 00	456 00		
13004	326	Kinoshita, K	110 00	108 00		
3921	676	Kitagawa, M	2,080 00	2,042 00		
8053	744	Masuhara, A	1,030 00	1,011 00		x
8650	381	Mochizuki, T	569 00	559 00		
11544	373	Morishita, N	2,654 00	2,606 00		
3119	339	Nagara, G	182 00	179 00		
8648	406	Nako, H	1,867 00	1,833 00		
11519	329	Nishiguchi, M., Co. Ltd	120 00	118 00		x
11519	329	Nishiguchi, M., Co. Ltd	660 00	648 00		x
11519	329	Nishiguchi, M., Co. Ltd	1,023 00	1,005 00		x
3963	372	Nitta, M	1,481 00	1,454 00		
Int. 1377	337	Oseki, N	300 00	295 00		
1656	338	Oshiro, E	174 00	171 00		
8981	325	Ota, U	496 00	487 00		
9072	355	Oyama, S	1,833 00	1,800 00		
8645	393	Sakamoto, Y	750 00	736 00		
11415	382	Shibata, C	607 00	596 00		
3947	404	Shigehiro, O	986 00	968 00		
3943	369	Takaoka, H	1,312 00	1,288 00		
3953	368	Takeda, F	2,242 00	2,201 00		
3953	368	Takeda, F	1,173 00	1,152 00		
3969	331	Yokoyama, M	1,495 00	1,468 00		
7551	719	Asano, M	111 00	109 00		
8786	692	Fujino, B	1,021 00	1,002 00		
5401	63	Fujishige, T	546 00	536 00		
4939	587	Furutani, C	1,915 00	1,880 00		
8630	652	Goto, B	589 00	578 00		
Int. 1298	717	Goto, M	56 00	55 00		
5612	588	Goto, T	425 00	417 00		
8644	650	Goto, Y	23 00	23 00		
8644	650	Goto, Y	1,567 00	1,539 00		
13566	718	Goto, Y	598 00	587 00		
4891	553	Hamanishi, S	121 00	119 00		
Int. 959	641	Hashimoto, Y	46 00	45 00		
4938	434	Hikida, K	3,284 00	3,225 00		
5592	590	Ibuki, M	2,411 00	2,367 00		
12519	591	Ikeda, T	94 00	92 00		
6897	646	Inaba, T	1,910 00	1,875 00		
4942	673	Inaba, Y	1,285 00	1,262 00		
4931	674	Kamada, T	1,728 00	1,697 00		

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-55
www.nikkeimuseum.org

File No.	J.L.	Name	Appraisal	Sale Price	Increased	Withdrawn
			$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	
7545	439	Katsumi, K.	56 00	55 00		
8633	663	Kawata, T.	1,836 00	1,803 00		
13763	693	Koizumi, Y. (Dec'd.)	1,720 00	1,689 00	.....	x
8643	716	Maruyama, T.	1,045 00	1,026 00		
6895	647	Miyazaki, S.	613 00	602 00		
8621 6183	648	Mukai, Y. Mukai, K.	780 00	766 00		
8640	694	Naga, H.	1,380 00	1,355 00		
5591	665	Nagamori, M.	1,610 00	1,581 00		
5599	664	Nagasaka, K.	2,066 00	2,029 00		
8051 7635 4588	593	Nishiyama, T. Nishiyama, M. Nishiyama, Y.	2,634 00	2,586 00		
8632	640	Note, K.	269 00	264 00		
4948	651	Oikawa, E.	240 00	236 00		
5613	608	Oikawa, H.	183 00	180 00		
3377	635	Oikawa, T.	144 00	141 00		
5590	715	Oikawa, U.	1,601 00	1,572 00		
8639	666	Okabe, K.	1,963 00	1,927 00		
1654 5127	594	Onotera, H. Onotera, T.	626 00	615 00		
8617	634	Otsuki, N.	5,533 00	5,433 00		
10352	595	Oyakawa, T.	2,845 00	2,793 00		
8626	714	Sakai, S.	1,206 00	1,184 00		
5125	632	Sakurai, S.	190 00	187 00		
7544	606	Sakurai, S.	474 00	465 00		
8631	596	Sano, N.	1,775 00	1,743 00		
6896	631	Saruwatari, H.	1,241 00	1,219 00		
8629	667	Sato, K.	2,337 00	2,295 00		
5598	607	Sasaki, K.	652 00	640 00		
8638	695	Sato, M.	524 00	514 00		
8635	668	Shudo, S.	447 00	439 00	.....	x
Int. 190	712	Sugawara, U.	47 00	46 00		
4944	669	Sumioka, T.	926 00	909 00		
5607	552	Suzuki, G.	285 00	280 00		
4945	670	Suzuki, K.	1,394 90	1,369 00		
4945	670	Suzuki, K.	384 00	377 00		
5602 5557	598	Suzuki, S. Suzuki, J.	418 00	410 00		
11499	633	Suzuki, T.	1,967 00	1,931 00		
7540	713	Suzuki, G.	116.00	114 00		
8625	599	Tagushi, K.	376 00	369 00		
4893	630	Takahashi, K.	242 00	238 00		
8620	711	Takahashi, S.	791 00	777 00		
1894	601	Takata, H. Y.	681 00	669 00		
8634	675	Takahashi, T.	1,013 00	995 00		
8623	671	Takayama, Y.	1,287 00	1,264 00		
5148	628	Takahashi, S.	948 00	931 00		
8636	710	Takenaka, S.	1,042 00	1,023 00		
9518	600	Tamaki, F.	2,057 00	2,020 00		
9518	600	Tamaki, F.	269 00	264 00		
9518	600	Tamaki, F.	94 00	92 00		
8618	672	Uno, A.	1,908 00	1,873 00	97 00	
1718	629	Ura, T.	148 00	145 00		
4926 4889	602	Wakai, S. Wakai, C.	1,786 00	1,754 00		
5421	29	Yanoshita, T.	45 00	44 00		
4928	709	Yukawa, Y.	1,011 00	993 00		
8642	554	Yukawa, Y.	1,380 00	1,355 00		
5606	402	Enta, T.	1,459 00	1,433 00		
7531	437	Fujii, Y.	606 00	595 00		
3839	445	Fujiki, H.	683 00	671 00	.....	x
13800	397	Fujinami, S.	42 00	41 00		
4929	568	Fukunaga, G.	445 00	437 00		
6893	485	Fukushima, T.	1,112 00	1,092 00		
7882	621	Hasebe, Y.	53 00	52 00	.....	x
9831	435	Hashimoto, N.	222 00	218 00		
10034	589	Higa, K.	2,115 00	2,077 00		
4938	434	Hikida, K.	1,476 00	1,449 00		
3841	477	Hirasawa, T.	2,421 00	2,377 00		
4890	547	Hirose, A.	36 00	35 00		
4940 4941	572	Hirose, T. Hirose, C.	621 00	610 00		
10036	906	Honda, G.	575 00	565 00		
3912	413	Hoshiko, T.	1,476 00	1,449 00		
3912	413	Hoshiko, T.	55 00	54 00		

File No.	J.L.	Name	Appraisal	Sale Price	Increased	Withdrawn
			$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	
3885	436	Ikeda, G.	308 00	302 00		
6775	440	Imahashi, I.	2,026 00	1,989 00		
6900	471	Imahashi, T.	3,693 00	3,626 00		
5080	441	Imamasu, H. Y.	376 00	369 00		
4979	433	Inokuchi, Y.	1,650 00	1,620 00		
8788	653	Inouye, Z.	3,980 00	3,908 00		
10039	638	Ioki, H.	679 00	667 00		
3875	401	Ito, G.	1,041 00	1,022 00		
4240	399	Ito, K.	228 00	224 00		
4242	398	Ito, S.	3,777 00	3,709 00		
6894	443	Kado, S.	1,101 00	1,081 00		
13495	444	Kado, S.	382 00	375 00	.....	x
4935	438	Kanai, F.	3,750 00	3,682 00	.....	x
11862	494	Kato, T.	296 00	291 00		
7545	439	Katsumi, K.	617 00	606 00		
6916	414	Kimura, T.	225 00	221 00		
Int. 799 Int. 1249	637	Kimura, S. Imahori, K.	472 00	463 00		
3845	442	Kosugi, U.	1,060 00	1,041 00		
6910	468	Kubodera, Y.	1,430 00	1,404 00		
7558	499	Kurahara, C.	502 00	493 00		
3851	478	Kurio, K.	95 00	93 00		
3851	478	Kurio, K.	799 00	785 00		
6892	403	Maeno, K.	1,870 00	1,836 00		
3877	448	Maruno, T.	1,325 00	1,301 00		
3881	745	Mori, S.	661 00	649 00		
7719	569	Morimoto, S.	550 00	540 00		
6903	644	Morioka, K.	3,373 00	3,312 00		
4236 3873	576	Mototsune, K. Mototsune, T.	387 00	380 00		
7532	461	Naganobu, C.	1,159 00	1,138 00		
6904	643	Nakamura, H.	2,992 00	2,938 00		
3847	432	Nakamura, J.	260 00	255 00	80 00	
3847	432	Nakamura, J.	245 00	241 00		
6899	475	Nakamura, S.	1,600 00	1,571 00		
13433	546	Nakano, S. S.	299 00	294 00		
10203	329	Nishiguchi, M.	3,822 00	3,753 00		
6366	573	Nishihata, J.	757 00	743 00		
9602	498	Nishioka, S.	3,513 00	3,449 00		
7041	574	Nobuhara, Z.	821 00	806 00		
3320	579	Obana, E.	150 00	147 00		
8555	578	Obana, K.	525 00	516 00		
4943	508	Ohori, M.	1,994 00	1,958 00		
4936	446	Ohori, Y.	214 00	210 00		
1652	577	Onishi, E.	225 00	221 00		
8980	487	Onishi, T.	1,045 00	1,026 00		
Int. 1186	400	Ono, S.	1,114 00	1,094 00		
Int. 1186	405	Ono, S.	1,357 00	1,232 00		
3628	482	Onodera, K.	1,060 00	1,041 00		
5015	469	Osaka, G.	178 00	175 00		
3769	470	Otani, T.	250 00	246 00		
8982	450	Otsuki, S.	3,346 00	3,286 00		
4626	450A	Otsuki, T.	669 00	657 00		
7528	449	Riujin, M.	737 00	724 00		
6902	583	Sano, S.	1,618 00	1,589 00		
3835	506	Sasaa, T.	800 00	785 00		
3887	482	Sato, A.	1,278 00	1,255 00		
7536	476	Sato, T.	3,579 00	3,514 00		
3918	412	Shigehiro, S.	1,114 00	1,094 00		
7538	597	Shimamoto, T.	418 00	411 00		
2298	488	Shinmoto, S.	1,064 00	1,045 00		
6908	483	Shinohara, K.	1,587 00	1,558 00		
1506	486	Shintani, N.	346 00	340 00	.....	x
3891	571	Sunada, N.	1,314 00	1,290 00		
3914	545	Takahashi, M.	565 00	555 00		
14856	447	Tamaki, K.	50 00	49 00		
14856	447	Tamaki, K.	32 00	42 00		
3879	642	Tanaka, G.	650 00	638 00	.....	
8782	636	Tanizaki, M.	1,000 00	982 00		
4937	740	Tashima, H.	1,342 00	1,318 00		
3853	575	Tomita, H. (In trust)	1,402 00	1,377 00		
Int. 906	481	Tsuchida, S.	1,194 00	1,173 00		
8780	680	Tsuchimoto, Y.	525 00	515 00		
4930	480	Tsukishima, H.	816 00	801 00		
10156	581	Tsumura, A.	143 00	140 00		
7424	462	Tsumura, C.	1,641 00	1,611 00		

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-56
www.nikkeimuseum.org

File No.	J.L.	Name	Appraisal	Sale Price	Increased	Withdrawn
			$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	
5614	544	Ujiye, F.	824 00	809 00		
3857	507	Ujiye, S.	179 00	176 00		
8781	510	Urano, S.	1,611 00	1,582 00		
6060	540	Watanabe, T.	1,488 00	1,461 00		
11116	472	Watanabe, U.	3,037 00	2,982 00		
7527	463	Yamasaki, S.	116 00	114 00		
7527	463	Yamasaki, S.	691 00	678 00		x
5447	570	Yamashita, M.	1,617 00	1,588 00		
3889	484	Yasui, S.	691 00	678 00		
12336	479	Yoshioka, Y.	270 00	265 00		
3783	422	Fujii, H.	750 00	736 00	64 00	
3783	422	Fujii, H.	1,741 00	1,710 00	140 34	
3362	396	Hinatsu, K.	2,492 00	2,447 00		
4064	429	Hirashima, Y.	892 00	876 00		
10465	428	Hosaka, C.	985 00	967 00		
7363	424	Ito, M.	373 00	366 00		
10657	453	Kaita, K.	241 00	237 00		
3705	464	Kaita, S.	778 00	764 00		
8664	431	Kaita, T.	1,200 00	1,178 00		
8664	431	Kaita, T.	284 00	279 00		
4218	455	Kamiya, J.	1,024 00	1,005 00		
3830	430	Katsumoto, J.	775 00	761 00		
4603	417	Kishiyama, K.	700 00	687 00		
10987	420	Kitagawa, S.	614 00	603 00		x
4216	454	Kobayashi, S.	727 00	714 00		
4206	423	Minaki, K.	800 00	785 00		
7380	388	Miyada, Y.	883 00	867 00		
8679	419	Mori, K.	1,465 00	1,439 00		
7281	383	Nagamatsu, D.	2,723 00	2,674 00		
8684	421	Nagamatsu, G.	775 00	761 00		
1540	427	Nagamatsu, N.	550 00	540 00		x
7379	418	Nagamatsu, S.	93 00	91 00		
1482	426	Nagamatsu, T.	1,224 00	1,202 00		
4202	384	Nishizawa, U.	600 00	589 00		
4200	411	Nishiziki, T.	809 00	794 00		
4198	416	Osaki, K.	852 00	837 00		
1720	395	Osato, F. S.	838 00	823 00		
4249 / 4247	459	Saito, S. / Saito, T.	1,163 00	1,142 00		
8273	387	Saito, S.	775 00	761 00		
5069	385	Sakamoto, K.	2,089 00	2,051 00		
4235	425	Suzuki, S.	1,238 00	1,216 00		
4235	425	Suzuki, S.	363 00	356 00		
4233	410	Tatsumi, S.	850 00	835 00		
4231 / 3603	457	Teramura, C. / Teramura, K.	422 00	414 00	114 00	
4209	458	Umemoto, Y.	83 00	82 00		
5002	677	Yamada, K.	3,001 00	2,947 00		
5005	456	Yamada, Y.	421 00	413 00		
5004	389	Yamasaki, I.	790 00	775 00		
10835	557	Doi, T.	1,800 00	1,767 00		
3293	474	Ebata, G.	3,100 00	3,004 00		
741	732	Fujino, M.	80 00	79 00		
3319	733	Fukushima, J.	2,066 00	2,029 00		
12136	528	Furukawa, S.	1,009 00	982 00		
1396	525	Hamamoto, U.	1,350 00	1,326 00		x
6643	734	Hamaura, M.	2,081 00	2,043 00		
12252	533	Hashimoto, Y.	700 00	687 00		
3385	519	Hayashi, E.	600 00	589 00		
4967	515	Hayashi, R.	1,998 00	1,962 00		
4970	566	Hikida, M.	1,800 00	1,767 00		
4973	561	Hikida, T.	1,198 00	1,176 00		
3308 / 1467 / 2915 / 7039	703	Hikida, Y. / Yasui, U. / Shirakawa, K. / Takahashi, G.	355 00	349 00		
3308 / Int. 1401 / 11275 / 7039	491	Hikida, Y. / Yoshida, S. / Koshiba, T. / Takahashi, G.	3,828 00	3,759 00		x
3308 / Int. 1401 / 11275 / 7039	491	Hikida, Y. / Yoshida, S. / Koshiba, T. / Takahashi, G.	1,006 00	988 00		x
3429	620	Hirata, I.	1,712 00	1,681 00		
1755	562	Hirose, T.	201 00	197 00		

File No.	J.L.	Name	Appraisal	Sale Price	Increased	Withdrawn
			$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	
6646	735	Hommura, K.	133 00	131 00		
1444	493	Nakamura, G.	1,000 00	982 00		
4972	524	Kawabata, B.	1,200 00	1,178 00		
1608	736	Kawamoto, C.	137 00	134 00		
5552	543	Kawase, T.	10,568 00	10,377 00		
2304	548	Kobayashi, K.	3,100 00	3,044 00		
691	555	Kochi, Y.	500 00	491 00		
1786 / 1758	707	Komori, H. / Komori, F.	1,779 00	1,747 00		x
9943 / 1785	473	Komori, M. / Komori, T.	3,419 00	3,357 00		
5133	505	Konishi, I.	2,650 00	2,602 00		
Int. 484	517	Koyanagi, R.	258 00	253 00		
5448	737	Koyanagi, S.	84 00	82 00		
2296	505	Kumagai, S.	1,793 00	1,761 00		
4976	527	Matsuba, S.	1,105 00	1,085 00		
4585 / 10056	556	Miyamoto, M. / Miyamoto, H.	675 00	663 00		
14309	514	Mineoka, T.	2,026 00	1,989 00		
4969 / 4975 / 4489	605	Mori, M. / Mori, K. / Mori, S.	2,350 00	2,307 00		
7294	662	Mori, T.	80 00	79 00		
3405	738	Motomura, K.	80 00	79 00		
3917	549	Murakami, A.	2,945 00	2,892 00		
661	536	Murakami, I.	575 00	565 00		
661	536	Murakami, I.	896 00	880 00		
13720	537	Murakami, K.	1,407 00	1,382 00		
689	645	Myzuguchi, D.	80 00	79 00		
9062	656	Nakade, S.	650 00	638 00		x
5551	559	Nakane, M.	2,776 00	2,726 00		
11009	518	Naruse, H. K.	4,150 00	4,075 00		
9208	564	Nishida, M.	1,500 00	1,473 00		
9208	564	Nishida, M.	1,000 00	982 00		
4966	541	Nishii, K.	2,125 00	2,086 00		
3919	525	Nishi, S.	1,500 00	1,473 00		
4997	534	Nishi, S.	975 00	957 00		
3919 / 3859	522	Nishi, S. / Nishi, H.	500 00	591 00		
5156	542	Nishii, T.	877 00	861 00		
4968	535	Okamoto, H.	218 00	214 00		
4968	535	Okamoto, H.	417 00	409 00		
13542	539	Okimi, N.	1,100 00	1,080 00		x
8837	612	River Fish Co. Ltd.	5,142 00	5,049 00		x
8837	612	River Fish Co. Ltd.	120 00	118 00		x
8837	612	River Fish Co. Ltd.	80 00	79 00		x
6225 / 4586	526	Sakiyama, F. / Sakiyama, K.	850 00	835 00		
5408	503	Sasaki, C.	761 00	747 00		
5408	509	Sasaki, G.C	1,135 00	1,114 00		
13808 / 1516	500	Sasaki, S. / Sasaki, T.	1,589 00	1,560 00		x
5903	504	Sasaki, S.	1,391 90	1,366 00		
1512	497	Sato, I.	3,033 00	2,978 00		
5571	558	Shiho, S.	1,100 00	1,080 00		
1739	516	Shimano, K.	1,912 00	1,877 00		
1743 / 699	529	Shimano, S. / Shimano, M.	725 00	712 00		
4608	551	Shoji, T.	875 00	859 00		
9861	661	Saimoto, Y.	1,640 00	1,610 00		
5457	501	Suda, K.	1,268 00	1,245 00		
12885	532	Suzuki, Y.	912 00	896 00		
6084	550	Taguchi, K.	925 00	908 00		
11164	530	Takahashi, F.	2,695 00	2,646 00		
11929	502	Takeda, H.	1,032 00	1,013 00		x
13499	521	Teranishi, F.	1,062 00	1,043 00		
3389	739	Teshima, N.	2,076 00	2,038 00		
4974	538	Yamamoto, Y.	1,927 00	1,892 00		
4964 / 6095	513	Yamamoto, Y. / Yamamoto, M.	1,920 00	1,885 00		
4229	531	Yoneda, H.	1,300 00	1,277 00		
1733	609	Yonemoto, G.	1,500 00	1,473 00		
4593	660	Yoshida, K.	1,512 00	1,485 00		
Int. 1401	492	Yoshida, S.	2,092 00	2,054 00		
Int. 1401	492	Yoshida, S.	3,875 00	3,805 00		
Int. 722 / 2315	520	Yoshisaki, Y. / Isomura, T.	1,570 00	1,542 00		

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-57
www.nikkeimuseum.org

File No.	J.L.	Name	Appraisal	Sale Price	Increased	Withdrawn
			$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	
9608 / 11337	306	Tsuchihashi, G. / Yasuda, T.	1,075 00	1,056 00		
10583	236	Adachi, A.	7,213 00	7,083 00		
Int. 1352	140	Nagamine, N.	191 00	189 00		
5419	408	Nakashima, T.	3,829 00	3,760 00		
5420	23	Shikaze, K.	875 00	859 00	.....	x
2312	407	Shikaze, M.	1,440 00	1,414 00		
2877	114	Tateyama, I.	2,867 00	2,815 00		
6623	409	Yamanouchi, K.	467 00	459 00		
6623	409	Yamanouchi, K.	1,543 00	1,515 00		
4647	465	Akagawa, Y.	478 00	469 00	3,531 00	
Int. 422	452	Konishi, K.	102 00	100 00		
12895	512	Kumagai, M.	203 00	199 00		
12900	511	Kumagai, J.	3,112 00	3,056 00		
1626	451	Matsushita, C.	570 00	560 00		
11490	496	Mitsui, S.	2,457 00	2,413 00		
4241	386	Sakamoto, M.	450 00	442 00		
10021	466	Takahira, S.	1,231 00	1,209 00		
1759	490	Takahira, F. R.	169 00	166 00		
Int. 1342	495	Yasuzawa, S.	50 00	49 00		
12095	742	Hamagaki, I.	110 00	108 00		
1506	746	Kawasaki, M.	1710 00	697 00	.....	x
10873	748	Konishi, H.	1,547 00	1,519 00		
10873	748	Konishi, H.	Nil	Nil	.....	x
10875	747	Konishi, S.	750 00	736 00	.....	x
10875	749	Konishi, S.	196 00	193 00		
3441	741	Yamazaki, B.	48 00	48 00		
768			865,672 00	849,999 00	3,818 22	61,552 00
				3,818 22		
768			865,672 00	853,817 22		
68			62,684 00	61,552 00	.....	x
700			802,988 00	792,265 22		

error in appraisal p. 395

APPENDIX "B"

ADDITIONAL OFFER OF THE DIRECTOR, THE VETERANS' LAND ACT, FOR THE PURCHASE OF 42 PARCELS OF FARM LANDS FROM THE CUSTODIAN OF ENEMY PROPERTY

File No.	J.L.	Name	Appraisal	Sale Price	Increased	Withdrawn
			$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	
5427	925	Ayukawa, K.	708 00	694 00		
4611	918	Ayukawa, S.	1,434 00	1,405 00		
5437 / 5333	921	Ikebuchi, T. / Hayashi, T.	477 00	467 00		
9781	920	Takahashi, Y.	752 00	737 00		
5580	912	Tomomitsu, H.	640 00	627 00		
5580	913	Tomomitsu, H.	123 00	121 00		
5581	919	Tsuji, S. T.	350 00	343 00		
3005	911	Yamada, S.	863 00	846 00		
9340	924	Nakashima, F.	935 00	916 00		
6909	917	Hinatsu, Y.	207 00	203 00		
4816 / 4983	916	Ikeda, A. / Ikeda, R.	345 00	338 00		
4241	386A	Sakamoto, M.	584 00	572 00		
1534	799	Morisawa, N.	594 00	582 00	.....	x
5511 / 5452	759	Tamura, T. / Tamuka, K.	1,127 00	1,104 00		
9599	806	Nishimura, C.	1,052 00	1,031 00		
11357	804	Sakata, M.	867 00	850 00		
5201	803	Yoshida, C.	964 00	945 00		
5360	775	Nakashima, E.	550 00	539 00		
1362	771	Nagata, K.	746 00	731 00		
5959	902	Sumi, C.	1,454 00	1,425 00		
4996	762	Kato, F. T.	1,041 00	1,020 00		
Int. 1251	760	Uchiyama, T.	2,148 00	2,105 00		
Int. 1251	760	Uchiyama, T.	616 00	604 00		
4004	754	Tateishi, I.	1,616 00	1,584 00		
4952 / Int. 1330	894	Kobayakawa, M. / Kobayakawa, H.	1,400 00	1,372 00		
3273	781	Mikada, M.	1,576 00	1,544 00		
1364	782	Murakami, K.	1,310 00	1,284 00		
3277	784	Murakami, T.	1,008 00	988 00		
3277	784	Murakami, T.	177 00	174 00		
3269	780	Ito, N.	989 00	969 00		
3275	785	Murakami, M.	2,390 00	2,342 00		
3281	795	Okano, K.	2,986 00	2,926 00		
3281 / 2139	795	Okano, K. / Okano, M.	250 00	245 00		
2137	801	Okano, J. S.	193 00	189 00		
5141	794	Minamide, B.	2,840 00	2,783 00		
5141 / 5162	797	Minamide, B. / Minamide, M.	1,516 00	1,486 00		
5166	813	Nagata, K.	3,000 00	2,940 00		
5139	796	Sumi, K.	1,174 00	1,150 00		
5143	792	Sumi, J. K.	1,932 00	1,893 00		
5158	800	Kadonaga, T.	1,689 00	1,655 00		
2869	793	Sasaki, K.	661 00	648 00		
5164	814	Konishi, K.	200 00	196 00		
42			45,484 00	44,573 00	NIL	582 00
1			594 00	582 00	.....	x
41			44,890 00	43,991 00		

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-58
www.nikkeimuseum.org

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, May 20, 1947.

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts met at 11.30 o'clock a.m., the Vice-Chairman, Mr. Gordon B. Isnor, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Beaudry, Burton, Cleaver, Cockeram, Cote (*Verdun*), Cloutier, Cruickshank, Dechene, Diefenbaker, Fleming, Fournier (*Maisonneuve-Rosemont*), Gladstone, Golding, Homuth, Isnor, Jaenicke, Johnston, Kirk, Marshall, Rinfret, Smith (*Calgary West*), Stewart (*Winnipeg North*), Stuart (*Charlotte*), Thatcher.

In attendance: Mr. Gordon Murchison, Director, Soldier Settlement and Veterans' Land Act; Dr. E. H. Coleman, C.M.G., K.C., Custodian of Enemy Property; Mr. F. G. Shears, Director, Vancouver Office of the Custodian, and Mr. K. W. Wright, Counsel.

The Vice-Chairman presented the Third Report of the Steering Committee, which is as follows:

It was agreed:

1. That the next meeting of the Committee be called for today at 11.30 a.m.

2. That Mr. Gordon Murchison, Director, Soldier Settlement and Veterans' Land Act, be heard today in connection with the purchase of properties in the Fraser Valley from the Custodian of Enemy Property, and their resale to veterans under the provisions of The Veterans' Land Act.

3. That should an application to appear before the Committee be received from the Co-Operative Committee on Japanese Canadians a convenient date be arranged for their hearing.

4. That the Steering Committee recommend that no invitations to appear before the Committee be extended to representative organizations or persons until applications have been received and considered by the Steering Committee.

On motion of Mr. Burton, the third report of the steering committee was concurred in.

The Committee resumed its investigation into the administration of the Vancouver office of the Custodian.

Mr. Shears filed a copy of the minutes of the Advisory Committee to the Custodian together with a copy of the correspondence exchanged between the Advisory Committee, the Custodian and the Director, Soldier Settlement and Veterans' Land Act, respecting the sale of 741 parcels of land.

Mr. Shears informed the Committee that certain typical individual files had been furnished the clerk of the Committee and were available to any member thereof for inspection.

Mr. Murchison was called, heard and questioned.

At 1 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned until Thursday, May 22, at 11.30 o'clock a.m.

A. L. BURGESS,
Clerk of the Committee.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-59
www.nikkeimuseum.org

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
May 20, 1947.

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts met this day at 11.30 a.m. The Vice-Chairman, Mr. Gordon B. Isnor, presided.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, would you be good enough to come to order now, please. The first order of business is the report from the steering committee, unless Mr. Burton wishes to make his correction now.

Mr. BURTON: Mr. Chairman, as a member of the steering committee I wish to draw your attention to an error in the report of the last meeting of this committee. On page 148 where the acting chairman said "I am told that the members of the steering committee who received copies of the report were: Mr. Burton, Mr. Fleming, Mr. Gibson, Mr. Marshall and Mr. Stewart." I wish to draw the attention of the committee to the fact that the Mr. Stewart should be Mr. Stuart, the member for Charlotte not Mr. Stewart, the member for Winnipeg.

Mr. FLEMING: Mr. Chairman, there is one other error in the minutes at page 118. It is in connection with the question I asked of Mr. Shears, I am quoting his reference to the list of 17 properties on which spot valuations had been taken by the custodian's office in Vancouver, or at least the advisory committee. "I see of the 17 properties the offer in the case of 15 is higher than the appraisal and lower in only two cases". It is quite clear from what follows, Mr. Chairman, there are two errors. It should read "I see of the 17 properties the valuations by the custodian and the advisory committee in the case of 15 is higher than the appraisal of the Soldiers' Settlement Board and lower in only two cases".

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Thank you Mr. Fleming. Now Mr. Burgess, would you be good enough to read the report of the steering committee.

(See minutes of proceedings).

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: You have heard the reading of the report of the steering committee of the standing committee on Public Accounts, what is your pleasure?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Is it George Murchison or Gordon Murchison?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: I think it would be Gordon. With that correction it is in order to move the adoption of the report.

Mr. BURTON: I would move the adoption of the report.

Mr. GOLDING: I second it.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: The report is moved by Mr. Burton and seconded by Mr. Golding and is presented for approval.

Carried.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I would like to make a correction on the record before we start. It is a very minor one but on page 103 of the minutes I am reported as having said "Last year, we paid berry-pickers in the province of British Columbia as much as we received for the berries in the previous year". It should be "years".

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-60
www.nikkeimuseum.org

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Thank you Mr. Cruickshank. Gentlemen, before we call on Mr. Murchison, I wish to inform you that Mr. Shears has tabled certain minutes and correspondence as requested in the meeting of May 12. The correspondence will be available and obtainable in the clerks office at any future time. There is also a considerable number of files regarding individual cases. After Mr. Shears had consulted with the clerk and myself, I felt that I should have him place these before us and I was going to suggest to you that these be placed in the custody of the clerk for a period of a couple of weeks and they will be available for any member who might wish to look them over. They are all individual cases which have been dealt with and are now closed. Would you care to make any further statement in connection with them Mr. Shears?

Mr. SHEARS: Mr. Chairman, if I might have just a minute or two before dealing with those files. The matter of assessment has been mentioned on several occasions to this committee. A committee member disagreed with my statement in which I said there is an assessed valuation and a valuation for taxation purposes. I have had that checked up both in the municipalities of greater Vancouver and in Vancouver and I really find my statement is correct. The assessment figure in every case covers the full value of the poreptry at which the real estate and improvements is valued by the assessor. Then, for taxation purposes, the full value of the land is taken and then a percentage, usually 50 per cent, is deducted. In that connection it simply amounts to a higher percentage as far as the mill rate is concerned. I would like to have it on the record that any time I have mentioned figures that the assessment, from the assessor's point of view, covers the full value of the property. There is just one other thing. I was asked if other assets were being administered in the Vancouver office, exclusive of the property of evacuees, and I said there were such assets being administered. I mentioned that there were some assets in the hands of liquidators but I find that I did not mention the amount to the credit of the enemy accounts in Vancouver. For the record these are the approximate figures for all assets now on hand. We are holding presently a credit to evacuee accounts of $820,000; we hold bonds for evacuees of $250,000; we have a credit to enemy accounts of $1,150,000; we have bonds belonging to enemies of $320,000; cash in the hands of liquidators amounts to $250,000; bonds in the hands of liquidators amounts to $560,000; outstanding payments not yet due on the sale of timber limits $300,000; making an over-all total of $3,650,000.

Then making reference to the files which are on the table before me I shall explain that I was asked to secure these various files from the Vancouver office in case members of the committee might like to see them and to see how the records are kept. There are files in connection with eight Japanese covering areas in Vancouver, New Westminster, Coquitlam, and Port Alberni. There is a file dealing with fishing vessels and a file dealing with chattels. In this particular case this is a file of one Japanese. It is in seven sections. I admit it is large but we have hundreds of files where the individual Japanese correspondence and the taking care of his affairs has needed files of that size. Files of that nature are quite average. Then, of course, there are a few which are relatively small, where the assets of the Japanese were not of very much consequence, that is in amount. Just for your information I would like to say this. These files where real estate in concerned have a section at the back in which the documents relative to real property are kept. For example there is the search of title, the search of the encumberances, and the rental agreements. There is a statement regarding taxation, the sale, and all the documents relative thereto. They are all filed together in that particular section of the file. Then I would like also to mention that in the front of the file we have what we call

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-61
www.nikkeimuseum.org

brief summaries of the complete file, using, as a matter of fact, different colours of paper. The white one is really a paper summary. It just gives a brief history of what will be found in the file relative to the administration of the property. That is to say it includes information as to how it was sold, to whom it was sold, and the basis of the sale, and what happens to the funds. Then there is another colour where we deal with fire insurance, and the question of liability. This file reveals no claim against the Japanese in this particular case. There is what is called the personal summary in the file which covers life insurance, accounts receivable and any shares and so on which he may have held. The yellow sheet is the chattel summary, which indicates the chattels that were left in the district, how they were handled and how they were disposed of finally. I thought I would just mention that so that if you were looking at these files the first thing would be to look at the summary at the top of the file. I may say that in some cases you will find that it states the Japanese has acknowledged receipt of the money that has been sent to him and in fact in quite a few cases the Japanese have expressed entire satisfaction with what the custodian has done on their behalf. I will admit that is not always so but there are quite a number of cases where the Japanese have expressed definitely their satisfaction in regard to the handling of their affairs. These files came to me and were immediately sent over to Mr. Burgess. I have not gone any further than just to look at them and to see the summaries on the top. I have not studied the files at all and so they come to me just as they will come to you as typical files which are in use in the Vancouver office.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Shears. Perhaps, gentlemen, I should explain these files are here today because of an inquiry made by members of the steering committee so that they would be available for study if required. Now is it your wish gentlemen to hear Mr. Murchison now?

Mr. FLEMING: Just before we go on to that, I take it Mr. Shears is going to be available for further questioning after we have heard from the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Yes, as Doctor Coleman stated at a recent meeting he will be available until the whole matter is cleared up.

Gordon Murchison, Director of the Soldiers' Settlement Board and the Veterans' Land Act, called:

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen, I find myself in a room this morning with which I am fairly familiar, although I see some newer faces around the table. I have many happy recollections of meetings which I attended before parliamentary committees in this room and I am happy indeed this morning, Mr. Chairman, to have this opportunity of appearing before your committee. I hope that I may be able to clear up any doubts that may be in your minds as to the manner in which the responsibilities and the duties of the department which I have the honour to head were carried out with respect to Japanese property. In a matter of this importance, sir, I have felt it desirable that I prepare a statement for presentation here this morning which I think will give the committee a good idea of the main background upon which the activities were undertaken, together with an outline of the activities as they proceeded. I will, therefore, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, present this statement to you.

I do not know what other witnesses said to this Committee, because I was not present during their testimony nor have I had the time to read the records of your proceedings.

For these reasons it may be that some of the things I say will be largely a repetition of things you have already heard. But in order to present a cohesive outline of my association with the appraisal, the purchase and resale of lands formerly owned by people of the Japanese race, it is necessary for me to outline the background upon which these activities were undertaken.

At the time I was asked and empowered to take an inventory and carry out an appraisement of these Japanese lands, the coastal areas of B.C. were in a position of some peril. All over the world the war was going extremely well for our enemies.

In the Spring of 1942 there was considerable anxiety as a result of reports of Japanese activity in the North Pacific. Lieutenant-General K. Stuart, Chief of the General Staff, went to the Pacific coast and himself assumed the duties of General Officer Commanding-in-Chief Pacific Command.

The Japanese invaded the Aleutian Islands in June 1942, opening the offensive with air attacks on the American base at Dutch Harbour on 3rd and 4th June. They landed troops on the Islands of Kiska and Attu on 7th June and proceeded to set up defences and establishments there.

On 20th June shells fell on Canadian soil when an enemy submarine fired at the wireless station and light at Estevan Point, Vancouver Island. This naturally caused much anxiety on the west coast. In September Major-General G. R. Pearkes, V.C., formerly Commander of the 1st Canadian Division, returned from England and took over the appointment of G.O.C.-in-C. Pacific Command, relieving General Stuart.

During this period of danger units of the R.C.A.F. were sent forward to reinforce Alaska and took part in the air offensive which the United States air forces conducted against the Japanese in the Aleutians.

The threat to the Pacific coast was removed when United States forces recaptured Attu, after fierce fighting (May, 1943), and when a combined United States-Canadian expedition arrived at Kiska to find that the Japanese had evacuated the island (15th August, 1943).

These conditions did not impress me or responsible members of my staff that the spring months of 1942 was the time to take an optimistic view of the value of Pacific coastal real estate, Japanese or otherwise. I venture to say there was no man living who could accurately forecast how long the war would last nor what the precise outcome would be.

If I recall correctly approximately ten months elapsed between the time the decision was made to evacuate the Japanese people from the defence area—and the time the actual evacuation was completed.

I have some recollection of the difficulty in finding or providing housing for these people in other parts of Canada. In the meantime it became known that Japanese land owners—in the certain knowledge they would be obliged to leave the defence area, were making emergency rentals of their properties. Having regard to the uncertainty as to how long the war would last—and to the specialized type of agriculture for which these lands were being used by their owners—it appeared a practical certainty that future trouble was in the making if rental agreements or term sale agreements negotiated by the Japanese were not brought under control by competent authority. I might mention here that the British Columbia Security Commission lacked the authority to deal with this aspect, and the official custodian was not empowered to deal with the land until the owner had been actually evacuated.

I think this committee will have a better appreciation of some of the problems involved when I tell you that these Japanese farm properties averaged a little less than 10 acres in size and with an average of slightly more than 5

acres under cultivation. There were greenhouses with an aggregate of 450,216 square feet of glass, used mainly in the production of tomatoes and cucumbers. There were poultry houses sufficient to accommodate 190,000 birds. There was a total of approximately 1,850 acres used for the production of small fruits, rhubarb, asparagus and hops—fully 50 per cent of this acreage was in strawberry plantations. Agriculture of this type requires a great deal of hand labour and patience, which is characteristic of the Asiatic people. But in their absence—it seemed highly problematic that there would be sufficient labour available to maintain such properties—and particularly because of the attractive rates of pay for labour required in war industry.

So here was another factor which indicated that caution was needed in appraising these properties.

Added to this was the fact that there was an annual municipal tax bill of approximately $40,000 to be paid regardless of who operated or occupied these lands and regardless of whatever revenue might be derived from rentals.

The appraisal of real estate is not an exact science. It is at best an expression of opinion based on factors which create or diminish dollar values. We did not appraise these properties from the standpoint of their potential speculative real estate value—or of their speculative value for sale during the war to persons in Canada who were participating in the financial prosperity produced by a state of war. We appraised them as the accredited agents of the Dominion Government to determine what in our judgment was the value of these properties, having regard to the hazards and uncertainties which existed in the early months of 1942. I submit that the appraisal made of these lands placed the Dominion Government in possession of a safe index upon which to determine the equity of the Japanese owners when they were evacuated. It provided a sound reflection of the problems that would inevitably be encountered if the lands were held under administration for an indefinite period and it provided an index to the compensation that might be paid to these people if a programme of liquidation were decided upon and sales made at prices less than appraised values.

The appraisal work actually commenced on May 4, 1942, and by the end of August 1942 the work had been practically completed. By that time 939 of these properties had been examined, with an aggregate appraisal of $1,059,419.

At this point I should like to make it clear—if this has not already been done by previous witnesses—that order in council P.C. 5523 of June 29, 1942, authorized the Director of Soldier Settlement to make this appraisal and also empowered the Director "to refuse to approve or approve either unconditionally or subject to such terms or conditions as to him seem fair and reasonable, the purchase, sale, lease or other acquisition or disposition, or any agreement therefor, of any agricultural land in a protected area of British Columbia owned by any person of the Japanese race or by any Japanese Company".

I think it is proper for me to say that the Dominion Government considered such control advisable to guard against private individuals or Japs trafficking in these properties and to enable the appraisal agency to carry out its work in an orderly fashion.

As an illustration of the need of control of this land I mention a situation which existed in the area surrounding Mission City. Here it was found that some 224 Japanese farmers were members of a co-operative marketing and shipping agency. The majority of the share capital of this co-operative was owned by these Japanese farmers, and under the terms of their membership there was a clause by which they were bound to deliver their total product to the co-operative or expose themselves to rather severe penalties. It appeared that immediately following decision by the Dominion Government to evacuate the Japanese, the management of this co-operative (which for all practical purposes centred in a certain white man, since deceased) by arrangement with

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-62
www.nikkeimuseum.org

the Jap shareholders—took immediate action to rent Japanese farms to white people under terms which, to say the least, were somewhat novel. The arrangement was that the co-operative borrowed funds from the local bank and after arriving at the rental consideration in each case the Jap owner was paid one-half of the rental consideration in cash and given a post-dated cheque for the balance. In turn the tenants gave the co-operative promissory notes for the total amount and these notes were in turn endorsed by the Jap owners. The rental agreements contained a clause obligating the tenant to deliver *all* his 1942 and 1943 product to the co-operative. Because of the inexperience of some of these tenants—or because of some misrepresentation or misunderstanding as to the actual acreages in production crops—or because of unfortunate climatic conditions which occurred during the crucial growing and marketing period, considerable dissatisfaction resulted among the tenants. So far as I am aware the Bank and the co-operative came out of the deal in good order due to the careful administration of the Custodian. But the tenants did not fare so well.

It was administrative problems of this character which doubtless had some bearing on the Government's decision to proceed with a general programme of liquidation of Jap assets including these farm properties. This decision was embodied in P.C. 469 of January 19, 1943, and I wish to emphasize that the first operative clause of that order in council revoked the authorities which had, up to that time, vested certain powers in the Director of Soldier Settlement. There were obvious reasons why these powers should be withdrawn, namely, that if the Director of Soldier Settlement and the Director the Veterans' Land Act (who were one and the same person) was to take any official interest in the purchase of any of these lands for the purposes of the Veterans' Land Act, he could not very well occupy the position of both judge and jury.

Another point which I wish to emphasize to this Committee is that when the Director of Soldier Settlement was instructed in April of 1942 to proceed with the appraisal of these lands there was no Veterans' Land Act on the statute books of Canada. It was enacted as of August 1, 1942, but there was no Director appointed until November 25, 1942. It would be preposterous to assume relationship between the appointment of a Director to administer an Act which would have effect all over Canada—and the liquidation of Japanese lands.

I am not so naive, however, as to suggest to this Committee that the Director the Veterans' Land Act was not in a good strategic position from the standpoint of acquiring some of these lands for Veterans' Land Act purposes.

From this point on my position and activities can be stated very simply. Examination was made of the inspection reports of 1942. We disregarded those we deemed to be quite unsuitable or beyond the scope of the Veterans' Land Act, such as greenhouses or other types of property which were of considerable value and involving a lot of administrative difficulty. Our selection narrowed down to 768 parcels, which carried our valuation of $867,021. We included a few which we might just as well have eliminated but there was the minimum or no improvements on them. I make no apologies for offering the custodian $750,000, or $117,021 less than the appraised value. I did not know how long the Veterans' Land Act would have to hold them or what the overall future problems would be. The custodian on the advice of his advisory committee, declined to accept this offer and in June 1943, I made a final offer of $850,000 which was accepted. When it came to taking title from the custodian it was found that some 41 properties had to be dropped from the deal for various reasons, such as the Jap owner having died and his affairs being administered by the official administrator. In some cases title difficulties were encountered or in others the encumbrances were in excess of the purchase price. I understand [illegible] the custodian elsewhere. It

was one of the conditions of my offer of $850,000 in June, 1943, that this price would include rentals collected by the custodian for the year 1943. These collections amounted to approximately $41,800. Payment of this sum to the director was asked for because the director the Veterans' Land Act assumed liability for municipal taxes from January 1, 1943, and the taxes for that year were reported to be approximately $40,000.

It subsequently developed—November, 1943—that we purchased from the custodian an additional 12 parcels on the mainland and 33 on Vancouver Island and other gulf islands. The price paid for these additional properties was $45,812. Our appraised value was $46,747.

It required quite a period of time to obtain title in fee simple for each parcel of land, and payments to the custodian were made only as registerable titles were secured. This was spread over a period of approximately nine months. It was firm administrative policy—approved by my minister—that these Jap lands should be withheld from sale to veterans until men who were serving overseas had a chance to get home and have an opportunity to buy them.

There were practically no veterans established under the Veterans' Land Act until the close of hostilities in Europe, which was in May, 1945. Thus we had these properties under administration for a period of approximately two years before we started to sell them.

In making plans for the sale of these lands to veterans—it has been deemed advisable to subdivide some of the larger parcels into two or more units and also to consolidate two or more of the smaller places into a single unit.

As of April 30 it was reported to me that 216 of these places have been sold in their original identity—100 more in the same category have been tentatively sold. 123 of the original units have been broken up into 394 units and of these subdivided places, 213 units have been sold and 75 tentatively sold. All these sales were to veterans. In other words, 604 Canadian veterans have been taken care of, and there is sufficient land left to take care of approximately 400 more if they are interested in what we have to offer.

Here I want to emphasize to this committee that sales made to veterans were at the prices paid by the director as provided by Section 9 The Veterans' Land Act. I hope that statement will put an end to any rumors or suspicions that the government—through the agency of the Director the Veterans' Land Act, has been doing any profiteering at the expense of Canadian veterans.

Sale has been made of a few parcels to non-veterans. They were as follows:

1. A property consisting of approximately 78 acres sold to a religious order. The cost to the director was $4,725. The sale price was $5,500 cash. This sale was in accordance with Section 22 of the Veterans' Land Act, which authorizes the director, among other things, to sell land which is at his disposal for sale, for religious purposes.

2. A parcel containing 100 acres on Salt Spring Island in the Gulf of Georgia. This property consists chiefly of rocky wooded hill, without any improvements. It could be used as a base for a commercial fisherman or as a firewood proposition. The director bought it for $245. There was no demand for it by veterans. It was advertised for sale by public tender—four offers were received ranging from $750 to $2,000. It was sold to the highest bidder under authority of P.C. 5285 of January 3 this year, pursuant to Section 21 of the Veterans' Land Act.

3. Three bush lots comprising approximately 38 acres 5 miles from Haney B.C. These were undeveloped places which had been logged off years ago and growing up with fair sized second growth softwood interspersed with stumps. The director paid $433 for these parcels. There was no demand by veterans. They were advertised for sale by public tender and brought a price of $3,050. This price doubtless reflects the demand there is at the present time for any kind of small logs and firewood.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-63
www.nikkeimuseum.org

There may be some differences of opinion as to the sales policy pursued by the director, having regard to the rapid rise in real estate values in the area centering on the largest Canadian city on the Pacific coast—once the peril of war had abated. I have three principal observations to make on that point if any one cares to raise it;

1. When these lands were purchased I was acting for the Dominion Government in the capacity of a trustee looking to the long range interests of Canada's fighting men who were overseas. It would have been a breach of the trust reposed in me to recommend a general increase in sale prices to correspond with local inflation.

2. The great majority of these Jap lands require substantial repairs to the more or less ramshackle buildings before they are habitable, or new homes have to be built. The cost of construction nowadays is just about double pre-war costs. The Director and veterans and members of this Committee have a pretty clear appreciation of this and in my judgment the cost price to the Director of the improvements needed, plus the cost of the land—will produce a sale price to a veteran which is as equitable as it can be made under present-day conditions.

3. The Japanese farms are by no means the only properties acquired by the Director the V.L.A. prior to the commencement of active settlement of veterans. Lands were purchased all over Canada at close prices which a couple of years later could have been resold in the open market for very considerable increases—but they weren't—they were sold to Canadian veterans at cost to the Director, as provided by Section 9 of the V.L.A.

In conclusion—may I say a word on behalf of the branch of the Public Service which I have the honour to head.

Regardless of some criticism we get now and then, and I suppose some of it is merited—there has developed over the past twenty odd years a considerable degree of both Government and public confidence in the reliability, rugged honesty and efficiency of these people in matters relating to land and land values.

Commencing in the early twenties this staff was designated as the land settlement branch of the Department of Immigration and Colonization. During the tough thirties it was this organization that was mainly called upon to service the appraisal requirements of Boards of Review under the Farmers' Creditors' Arrangement Act of 1935. Many thousands of farm properties, all over Canada, were inspected and appraised for that purpose. During the war we were frequently called upon by the Department of National Defence to assist and advise on land matters of considerable magnitude. We represented the Dominion Government in acquiring the freehold lands required for the construction of the Alaska Highway. During and since the war we have purchased many millions of dollars worth of real property for the establishment of Canadian veterans. I mention these things to this Committee to indicate that a great fund of practical knowledge and experience was brought to bear on the part assigned to us in connection with Japanese lands.

Acting for the Dominion Government, we examined this situation in a spirit of realism—justice and equity for all parties concerned. We were considerate and prudent in our estimates as became those who were asked to undertake serious responsibilities of this nature during the grim and perilous days of 1942.

When that duty had been discharged in good faith we proceeded to act in equally good faith on behalf of Canadian veterans by buying these lands at the fairest price we could obtain.

I submit that, in the circumstances, the Japanese people were dealt with justly and equitably. The Canadian public was protected and Canadian veterans [illegible] the purchase of these lands in

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-64
www.nikkeimuseum.org

the midst of a great war which, but for the grace of God and our fighting men and allies might have lasted much longer and turned out quite differently than it did.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, the witness is yours.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. May I ask a few questions, Mr. Chairman?

Taking the last part of the evidence tendered by Mr. Murchison, first, I would like to ask a few questions with reference to the disposal of the properties. First of all you mentioned the cost of construction. What works of construction were undertaken on those lands by your department before the sale to the veterans, if any?—A. I could not answer that question precisely. That is a matter on which I would have to make inquiries. I believe that a limited number of those Japanese lands were used in the development of small holdings and I judge few houses were constructed before the property was made available for sale to the veterans. In other cases single units sold to veterans would provide for the cost price of the land plus a loan necessary to carry out the repairs to existing buildings and for the construction of a new home.

Q. In each case, I take it, you have a record of any expenditures made and its inclusion in the sale price to the veteran?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now we have, as appendix A to the proceedings of the last meeting of this committee, at pages 163 and following, a list of the properties that were included in the sale to your department. Could we have the corresponding information with reference to those properties inserted on the list to show inclusion of any cost of construction work done by your department? That, I take it, could be prepared Mr. Murchison?—A. That could be prepared. It might produce a little bit of confusion in cases where it is found that say parcel number 143 on the list and say another one a good deal further down in the schedule were combined in one unit and a loan approved for the price of the land and the improvements required.

Q. Well I do not want to take time on it now because obviously you have not the information in these individual cases but I think the committee would like to have that. Now turn for a moment to those sales of other properties which you made. The first property was sold pursuant to section 22 of the Veterans' Land Act to whom?—A. To a religious order, the Westminster Priory.

Q. Would gou give us the two prices on those? You went pretty quickly over them and I did not get a note of them.—A. The cost price was $4,725 and the sale price was $5,500.

Q. And the date?—A. I have not got the date but I recall it was late in 1946.

Q. The next one? Were those all sold at public auction? Has there been any advertisement?—A. Not respecting the first one that was sold to the religious order.

Q. There was no auction?—A. No.

Q. Just private negotiation?—A. It was sold to the religious order under the authority of section 22 of the Act and approved by the minister.

Q. And the next one?—A. There was a parcel of 100 acres on Salt Spring Island bought for $245. It was advertised for sale by public auction and the four offers received ranged from $750 to $2,000. It was sold to the highest bidder on January 3 of this year and it was confirmed by order in council.

Q. Then the last, the bush lots you bought for $433 and sold them at what?—A. They were sold for $3,050.

Q. At public auction?—A. Yes.

Q. Now having regard to the fact that you made an offer in 1943 and it took nine months to get the titles, you did not begin to sell the properties until two years later? Do you say it was necessary for you to have acted in 1943 to acquire the properties?—A. How is your question put?

Q. You have referred to the long delay before you began to make sales of these properties to the veterans?—A. That is right.

Q. Was there any occasion to have acquired those properties so early? What you did in 1942, or at least what was done in 1942 through the agency of that order in council, was to blanket these properties so that they could not be sold to anybody else? That is correct, is it not?—A. That is right.

Q. The values were made, as you said, when the war was at its darkest in 1942. The properties were purchased in 1943, but you did not begin sales to veterans until the conclusion of the war?—A. That is right. That was the general policy all over Canada.

Q. In other words you were acquiring properties at that time with a view to reselling them sometime later. In this case it was two or three years later?—A. That is correct.

Q. Now what about your procedure in approaching this question. We will leave now the resale but I want to address this question to you. You purchased, on behalf of your department, seven hundred and forty-one Japanese farms. You view that purchase, I take it, with some satisfaction in view of what you have said this morning.—A. I certainly do.

Q. And I suggest to you that the valuation was admittedly a conservative valuation as made in 1942 by your appraisers?—A. I think I have so stated.

Q. It was a conservative valuation, made with a view to purchase of the properties.—A. No.

Q. What was the basis of the original appraisal?—A. As I said in my evidence, I can perhaps find it here if you will wait.

Q. Well you probably can give that to us?—A. We appraised them as accredited agents of the Dominion of Canada to determine what, in our judgment, was the valuation of the properties having regard to the hazards and uncertainty which existed in the early months of 1942.

Q. Yes, with a view to what?—A. Establishing an index, a safe index, upon which to determine the equity of the Japanese owners when they were evacuated. It provided a sound reflection of the problems that would inevitably be encountered if the lands were held under administration for an indefinite period and it provided an index to the compensation that might be paid to these people if a program of liquidation were decided upon and sales made at prices less than appraised values.

Q. You had in mind as one purpose that the appraisal might be used for the sale of these properties?—A. Yes, of course.

Q. And purchase of them by your department?—A. I could not say that, sir, because at that time there was no Veterans' Land Act in existence and there had been no director appointed.

Q. Very well. Now you say the work of appraisal commenced on May 4, 1942? I think that is the date you said.—A. That is right.

Q. And it was completed by August of 1942. Now the order in council under which you were proceeding, P.C. 5523 was not made until June 29, 1942? —A. That is right.

Q. You were ahead of the gun on the appraisal?—A. I was acting in accordance with instructions from the dominion government.

Q. Your minister instructed you to proceed?—A. Yes, and he said the necessary statutory authority would be provided as quickly as possible.

Q. And were the instructions that you received at that time to the effect that you have quoted in your evidence?—A. No, our instructions were to carry out an inventory and appraisement of those properties.

Q. There was no indication as to the basis of the appraisal or the purpose of it?—A. No, as appraisers we faced the realities as we found them on the ground.

Q. When you came to make your offer in the spring of 1943, your appraisals were then almost a year old, were they not?—A. Yes.

Q. And what had been the direction in which land values in the Fraser Valley area had been moving in that year?—A. Well I should say that the peril on the Pacific coast had pretty well abated by midsummer in 1943 and consequently that would have an effect on improvement of land value in that particular area. Of course there was a great influx of war workers and other people to the Pacific coast at that time who were finding difficulty in securing housing. There was a tremendous demand for accommodation by those people and that would have an inflationary effect. Possibly it would have been temporary.

Q. That does add up to this fact that valuations in the area in question had advanced between your valuation in the spring of 1942 and your offer in the spring of 1943?—A. I should not be surprised.

Q. And your original offer was for substantially less than your own appraisal?—A. That is right.

Q. Now does that suggest to you that you were proceeding on the basis of the appraisal and that you were seeking to make a good buy on behalf of your department?—A. I was just seeking to make the best buy I could on behalf of the department and the boys who were fighting overseas and I considered in making the offer of $750,000 cash, that that amount of money was entitled to some respect. It was not accepted and I made a final offer of $850,000. In other words I made the best deal I could for those men.

Q. In other words you bought at the lowest price you could for the reasons you have given?—A. That is right.

Q. You bought at the lowest price you could, that is a fair statement?—A. Yes.

Q. So far as the interests of the owners are concerned, it is fair to say that you left it to the custodian to protect those interests as vendor in the transaction?—A. Yes.

Q. The protection of the Japanese was his concern, and it was not your concern? I take it your principal concern was to get the farms at the lowest price you could get them?—A. That is right.

Q. And you had representatives from your department present at some of the meetings in Vancouver? I mean the meetings of the advisory committee who the custodian appointed to advise him in connection with the liquidation of the properties?—A. Yes. I had an advisory committee to advise me, the same as the custodian had an advisory committee advising him.

Q. You had your representatives present at the meetings when these matters were discussed?—A. That is right.

Q. And I take it you may not be personally familiar with the course of those discussions in those committees or the reasons which interested the committee appointed by the custodian? That was not your concern I take it? —A. No.

Q. Now on the basis of your valuation, at one point in your evidence, if I am correct, you said farms were not to be valued from the point of view of their potential value or valuation for resale but, the valuation was to be made having in mind the hazards and uncertainties which existed in 1942?—A. That is not just what I said.

Q. Pardon?—A. I said we did not appraise those properties from the standpoint of their potential speculative real estate value or of their speculative value for sale during the war to persons in Canada who were participating in the financial prosperity produced by a state of war.

Q. Yes, and you proceeded to do what you did under the protection of an order in council which, in effect, took those lands out of the public market entirely?—A. I had the appraisal made but the decision was reached by the dominion government as to what was to be done with them.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-65
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Q. The lands were never taken out of the scope of that blanket order in council until this sale was completed?—A. Oh yes.

Q. Will you give the date?—A. Yes.

Q. We are referring now to order in council P.C. 5523 of June 29, 1942, are we not?—A. Yes, and P.C. 469 of January 19, 1943.

Q. Yes, that authorized liquidation did it not?—A. Yes. I think if you read the order and if you have it before you you will find as I said the first operative clause in it revoked the authorities which had up to that time vested certain powers in the Soldiers' Settlement Board.

Q. Yes, but you are familiar with what the custodian was doing with respect to those properties and no public offer was made of any of those properties before you completed the purchase of those properties? That is correct, is it not?—A. As far as I know, but I cannot be absolutely sure on that because I do not know just what properties the custodian disposed of in the interim.

Q. If you do not know I will not pursue the question because we can get the information from another source. You concerned yourself with your side of the transaction?—A. Yes.

Q. And your interest as you have indicated was to get this property at the best price you could?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Cockeram:

Q. Mr. Murchison stated that 604 veterans had been established and had purchased property and there are still 400 more properties to be disposed of. Could Mr. Murchison tell the committee what was received for those 604 properties that have already been sold?—A. I have not got the figure before me but I assure you that the places were sold at their cost to the director, that is the price we paid to the custodian.

Q. I think we should have that figure.—A. I can get it for you but I have not got the figure here.

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. Mr. Chairman, arising out of what Mr. Murchison said I take it when you want to value this property on the coast that you did not believe the Japanese were going to win the war, otherwise you would have placed a value of nil on those properties?—A. Will you state that question again sir?

Q. I take it, when you valued those properties first in 1942, you did not believe the Japanese were going to win the war?—A. I should say in reply, and I am not trying to dodge the question, that we had the same hope as the rest of the allied world that ultimately we were going to win but we did not know when nor under what conditions.

Q. But you were not optimistic about this state of affairs?—A. No.

Q. And that lack of optimism might have had some effect on your judgment as to the value of the lands?—A. Certainly it would. And very necessarily it should have had some effect.

Q. So the valuation you arrived at was not necessarily the true value from the point of view of those who were working on it?—A. Not if the people were going to be evacuated and the government was to be faced with the great problem of administration and security and the specialized type of agriculture for which there was an inadequate labour force available. That would be an entirely different set of conditions.

Q. But from the point of view of those who had the land at that particular time, the value you placed on it would probably be lower than that which they would place on it, and it was certainly lower than the assessed value?—A. Of course the assessed value is only an index of the taxation that the municipality requires.

Q. Have you any knowledge of the value placed on this land by the custodian or the agents of the custodian?—A. Not the details but I recall when my first offer of $750,000 was made that representatives of the custodian's advisory committee made a spot check on possibly a dozen of those properties and on that basis advised the custodian that in their judgment my offer was too low.

Q. So in the opinion of the custodian the lands were valued at more than you would give?—A. I do not know what the custodian valued it at but apparently it was more than $750,000.

Q. Now you say you bought the land at the lowest price and you also said you approached the whole problem from the point of view of realism, justice, and equity, which is right and proper; but justice and equity has occasionally more than one face. Which point of view were you approaching from? Was it the equity of the owners of the land or was your department getting the best possible buy?

Mr. GOODERHAM: Are you speaking of the appraisal by the Soldiers' Settlement Board or the purchase price?

By Mr. Stewart:

Q. The purchase price?—A. When it came to the matter of purchase I was not concerned with anybody's welfare but the veterans for whom I was buying.

Q. Therefore, your approach to the whole problem had nothing to do with what the owners might be considering was their value? You were not approaching it from that particular point of view.—A. When it reached that stage my intention was to acquire those lands at the best price I could, knowing that it would eventually be sold to veterans.

By Mr. Smith:

Q. I have a couple of general questions. In answer to Mr. Stewart you said the assessed value was only an index of the taxes the municipality requires. You did not mean that, did you?—A. I did not get your question, sir.

Q. You stated, in answer to Mr. Stewart, that the assessed value of the land was only an index of the taxes the municipality required. You did not mean that, did you?—A. Yes, I did.

Q. Well let us assume that the assessment is low. You could raise the mill rate and get the same amount of money could you not?—A. That is right.

Q. So the assessed value is not the only index?—A. The assessed value has a relation to the mill rate, yes.

Q. But all you have to do is to raise the mill rate on a low assessment to get the same amount of money that you would if you had a high assessment and a low mill rate so that the mill rate, perhaps is an index of the tax.

Now only a general question about the method of assessment. I may say that I appreciate your efforts in doing what you could for the returned men but you said to Mr. Fleming a moment ago that these hazards were there. Did you in 1942, find any depreciation in the value of sales of real estate in the Fraser Valley? In fact were they not advancing in 1942 in the Fraser Valley?—A. We had not entered the market at that time to buy any real estate.

Q. In valuing any real estate there are a couple of books which you can get on the matter?—A. Certainly.

Q. Whether they are any good or not, there are some books published on real estate valuation. Is not the main ground for valuation the sales of similar property in the area? Is that not accepted as one of the main grounds?—A. That is one.

Q. All right, and you discarded that.—A. I did not say I discarded it.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-66
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Q. I think if you look back through your evidence you will find that, or at least that is what I understood. You did not bother about sales?—A. We did not pay any attention to sales. We were dealing with what we considered to be the equity of the Japanese having regard to the problems confronting the dominion government in looking after these lands.

Q. You did discard any evidence of other valuation or sale?—A. It was not taken into account.

Q. Then my word is discard. It was not taken into account?—A. That is correct.

Q. Then in all valuation of land, speculative value is another element?—A. Yes.

Q. So that you discarded the two main elements in valuing these properties? Correct?—A. Well, as I indicated in my general statement we did not consider speculative value of real estate on the Pacific coast very much at the time in view of the conditions which existed.

Q. I will use your words. You did not take into account either of those elements in making your valuation?—A. No.

Q. Thank you.

By Mr. Jaenicke:

Q. Mr. Murchison, you described to us the serious situation at the coast in 1942, that was with respect to the war. Did you mean to intimate there was a danger of invasion?—A. Yes.

Q. And you took that into consideration when you made these appraisals?—A. That is what I stated.

Q. I see now on May 29 you wrote Mr. McPherson in Ottawa, the Department of Secretary of State and you said this, "Our appraisement of these lands was made on the basis of ordinary terms of sale and without regard to any temporary boom or speculative value brought about by a state of war." Now, would that not contradict your statement here?—A. It may sound contradictory.

Q. But you say, or you try to intimate, because of the war values had gone down, and in this letter you stated there was a boom on.—A. It had gone down in our judgment.

Q. There was a boom then at the time when you made the valuation?—A. There was a brisk demand by temporary war workers in Vancouver which we regarded as purely artificial.

An Hon. Member: And transitionary.

The Witness: And transitionary.

By Mr. Jaenicke:

Q. Is that boom still on or has it subsided?—A. I should say it is beginning to subside.

By Mr. Cruickshank:

Q. Is it not true at the time the department bought this land that there was no demand by the general public for small berry farms?—A. I should say that was generally correct.

Q. One reason being that there was not labour available for that class of farm?—A. That is right.

Mr. Gladstone: In connection with your purchase of farms in Ontario for veterans, in 1942, would the speculative value be upwards or would it be downwards due to war conditions?

The Vice-Chairman: Mr. Gladstone, you are not getting into a discussion of land values and appraisals in Ontario, are you?

Mr. Gladstone: No.

The Vice-Chairman: I just want to guard against that.

The Witness: We feared right from the date that the Veterans' Land Act was enacted, on August 1, 1942, that the statute itself would have an inflationary effect on lands throughout Canada. It created a potential demand for tremendous amounts of farming land all over the dominion. There is no doubt about that. That is one of the reasons why the government and parliament authorized the administration to proceed as quickly as it did after the Act was passed, to assemble lands as a hedge for the settlement of veterans when they returned from overseas. There would be at least something to show.

By Mr. Jaenicke:

Q. Just one more question, which is about these rentals. You were going pretty fast then, and I was trying to make some notes but I could not get it down. You said that the rentals for 1943 amounted to $41,800?—A. That was the amount.

Q. Did you collect that?—A. No, that was collected by the custodian.

Q. Did the custodian pay it over to you?—A. He did.

Q. And you mentioned something about taxes.—A. I in turn assumed responsibility for the year's taxes, for 1943.

Q. The correspondence would bear out, as far as I can see, that you were only assuming the taxes from the date of purchase?—A. No, there was a condition in the purchase that I would undertake payment of taxes as of January 1, 1943.

Q. And those taxes amounted to how much?—A. Approximately $40,000.

Q. Not quite as much as you collected in rentals?—A. Not quite, but very close.

Q. Approximately the same?—A. Approximately the same figure.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Just dealing with the last point first. The rentals that you spoke of were rents that had been collected between January 1 and the date when the contract was entered into?—A. That is right.

Q. The taxes of $40,000 were the taxes for the full calendar year, 1943, were they not?—A. Yes.

Q. And the proportion which would have accrued up to June would be approximately $15,000 or $16,000?—A. It would be roughly 50 per cent, I suppose.

Q. A trifle under 50 per cent, so that in respect of the adjustment of rents against taxes you probably were $25,000 better off on the deal?—A. Probably, but it was part of the negotiation.

Q. It was one of the elements that makes you feel that you made a good bargain for those for whom you were concerned, namely, the veterans who were going to buy?—A. That is right.

Q. Now, then, in connection with the proceeds of the sale of those three properties you referred to, which were not sold to veterans but were sold to private interests, what steps have been taken, if any, by your department to account to the owners, the former owners, for the excess over and above the amount you paid for those properties?—A. None.

Q. None. You are retaining that. If, in the course of the disposal of the remaining lands any of them are not sold to veterans but to private purchasers at an advance over the amount you paid, there will be no accounting to the former Japanese owners, I take it?—A. That is a matter of government policy.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-67
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Q. But there has been no indication as far as you are aware that anything will be done to make that excess realized available to the former Japanese owners?—A. No, and at the moment there is no guarantee for the sale of these Japanese lands which are left, which as might be expected are the least attractive we have. There is no guarante that the veterans are going to be prepared to buy them at the price we paid for them.

Q. With reference to the "least attractive," that also applies to those you sold elsewhere. I think you did very well on those, if they were the least attractive of the group you purchased. You resold them at a price considerably in advance of the price you paid for them and all in all I think you are going to do very well.—A. I hope so.

Q. It does not look to me as if you are going to be in for a loss; it looks like a profit.—A. I would be very glad to be in that position.

Q. That also would lend to the feeling you have about the good bargain you drove with the custodian?—A. Probably, very probably.

Q. Now you have indicated you were not aware of any steps, and I hope I interpreted you correctly, taken by the custodian while you were negotiating for the 741 properties and the sale of other properties elsewhere. I had difficulty following that. Surely you must have known that at that time there was no other offer being made by the custodian of those lands to anyone else. You were the only person who was being permitted to dicker for those lands.—A. I should just like to clear up a point there. We had appraised some 950 properties owned by the Japanese and our offer was narrowed to 768. As I said we did not know what other lands the custodian was disposing of in the meantime because our offer had not included all the Japanese land.

Q. All right, there might have been about 125 or 130 properties that you did not include in your offer but they had been the subject of appraisals by your department?—A. That is right.

Q. And for reasons that seemed good to you, you did not include them in the offer? You did not want them.—A. That is right.

Q. They could not have been desirable for resale afterwards?—A. Some were much too valuable for us to buy.

Q. But as to the remainder you say you do not know what the custodian was doing about those 130-odd properties, but you must have been aware that as to the lands that you were offering on—the 769—there was nobody else being allowed to compete with your offer; you were aware of that, were you not?—A. Yes, I think that is a fair statement.

Q. Once you had made an offer for the 760 or 768—whatever it was—those were frozen by the custodian; and you were aware that nobody had been permitted to offer—there was no public offering of them in any way, shape or form, and you were not facing any competition?—A. I presume that would be the case. But I cannot state what the custodian was doing with those other lands, because they were entirely within his control.

Q. Yes, but being quite fair, you were aware, I assume—you must have been aware that you had no competitors to face for those properties?—A. Absolutely no; there was nobody else cared to pay $750,000 or $800,000—

Q. And by reason of the policy being followed—government policy. Nobody was being permitted to offer for any of the properties, let alone the whole group en bloc.—A. That is probably true. As I say, I cannot say precisely what the custodian was doing.

Q. Now you keep using the expression "my offer" and "I offered". I take it that so far as the internal arrangement of your department is concerned, you would take the responsibility for this matter because you were the director of soldier settlement?—A. Yes. The director was established as a corporation sole with powers to do certain things.

Q. To what extent was what you did or what you offered approved by your minister? Did you consult your minister in connection with these offers or appraisals?—A. No, sir, I referred our offer to our advisory committee at New Westminster. There was not a move made by me without acting on their advice. When the negotiations had reached a stage of final offer and acceptance I referred my offer to the Secretary of State, the official custodian. Here is my final offer of $850,000. There was a letter prepared by our district superintendent in Vancouver; and the formal acceptance of that offer was over the signature of the Secretary of State.

Q. You received a letter from the Hon. Norman McLarty dated June 23, 1943, purporting to accept your offer?—A. That is right.

Q. Now, he was the minister concerned on the side of the vendor. What I was asking you was whether you had acquainted your minister with the offer, or kept in touch with him with regard to the offer you were making and which was accepted by Mr. McLarty by that letter?—A. Yes, orally.

Q. You kept in touch with the progress of negotiations?—A. I saw him almost constantly. My minister at that time was the Hon. Mr. Crerar.

Q. I suppose it goes without asking that what you did you did with his full approval?—A. That is right.

Q. And we can infer that whatever you did in the course of having appraisals made, making the offer, negotiating purchases and finally consummating, was done with the full knowledge and approval of the minister to whom you were responsible?—A. Yes, I would say that is fair.

By Mr. Cleaver:

Q. In regard to this matter we must, of course, be fair to the custodian as well as to you, and there were one or two answers which you made to Mr. Fleming's questions that I feel might lead to a misapprehension. When you made the offer to the custodian—made the initial offer—was the custodian under any responsibility to you to not accept a better offer from someone else if a better offer had come along?—A. None whatever, as far as I was concerned. No, he was quite open and under no responsibility.

Q. He was quite open to accept a better offer if a better offer was available?—A. I should say so.

Q. But you were in the happy position that you were prepared and able to make a blanket offer for a large percentage of these properties and you naturally negotiated the best deal that you could for the veterans?—A. That is right.

Q. And he, on the other hand, would be getting from you the best price that he could get from you?—A. That is right.

By Mr. Burton:

Q. You said when your final offer was accepted you assumed the responsibility for the paying of the taxes for the whole year, starting from January 1, and in the meantime the custodian had turned over to you approximately the same amount in rents that had been collected. I presume that was up to that time?—A. That is right.

Q. Could you tell us how much more was collected in rents for the balance of that year?—A. Speaking from memory only I believe the additional amount we collected was somewhere in the neighbourhood of $8,000. I would have to check on that.

Q. According to that, most of the rents had already been collected by the custodian?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, the excess of rent collected over taxes—what was done with those funds?—A. They were remitted to the Receiver General.

Q. It was not put in to offset some of the improvements made?—A. No.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-68
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Mr. FLEMING: May I clear up one point before we conclude our sitting before 1 o'clock?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: May I ask one question? Is it possible for us to have a similar list in this case as is filed by the custodian as to what the properties had been sold for?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Which page do you refer to?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Is it not possible to have the same list prepared of the properties that have been sold to veterans?

The WITNESS: I will get it for you as closely as I can. However, I direct your attention to this fact that this list supplied by the custodian identifies names and numbers; it does not identify legal descriptions of property. Now, we found in completing this transaction there would be several individual titles relating to one composite property held by a single Japanese.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: What I am interested in finding out is 2,862. I am interested in knowing about file No. 2,862. That property was sold to the department for $970. Now, presuming that piece of property is sold to the veteran I want to know what it was sold for?

The WITNESS: I will get that as closely as I can for the committee.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. With regard to the matter of adjustment. Mr. Murchison, your original offer, which was $750,000, contemplated the adjustment of the taxes to the rents at May 31, did it not?—A. No, I do not think that condition was attached to the $750,000 offer, because that was made quite a time before June 1943.

Q. Mr. Barnet was making an original offer on your behalf?—A. Yes.

Q. Will you look over Mr. Barnet's letter dated May 17, 1943, written on behalf of Soldier Settlement of Canada to The Custodian of Japanese Properties, and you will find that he is offering $750,000. Speaking about the adjustment he says first of all that the taxes and charges are to be paid or adjusted to May 31, 1943.—A. What is the date of the letter?

Q. May 17, 1943. This is the first offer of $750,000.—A. Addressed to Mr. McPherson?

Q. This is addressed to The Custodian of Japanese Properties in Vancouver, B.C. And then we find this provision: "Assignment to the Director, the Veterans' Land Act, of all leases and unpaid rentals as at May 31, 1943." You will recall that from that point on your raised your offer to $800,000?—A. $850,000.

Q. First of all you raised it to $800,000, and you could not get the custodian's advisory committee to accept that?—A. That is right.

Q. And the custodian's advisory committee talked first of all about $1,000,000, but you were not prepared to go that far? Then you came up to $825,000 on the terms as to adjustment contained in the first offer, accompaning the letter of May 17, 1943; is that right?—A. You have the correspondence there. That is right. I have not got it before me.

Mr. CLEAVER: I think the witness should have the correspondence before him. It is not fair to the witness otherwise.

Mr. FLEMING: I am nearly through. The correspondence is before the witness now.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. You have the letter of May 17, 1943, before you?—A. Yes.

Q. Then you will recall that the next step I refer to was that Mr. Barnet on your behalf raised the offer to $800,000—is that correct—on the same terms as in the correspondence you have before you, sir?

Q. Yes. That is contained in the correspondence there. I do not want to belabour the details. I think it is quite clear. The point I am getting at is on the matter of adjustment. Do you recall that the next step was that the custodian's committee came down from $1,000,000 to $900,000; do you remember that?—A. I do not recall him coming down to $900,000.

Q. Then you recall that your offer came up to $825,000?—A. Yes, I recall that.

Q. You recall that that was on the basis as to adjustment contained in the original offer of May 17?—A. I would have to check the correspondence on that.

Q. Would you mind doing that?—A. My mind does not cover all that.

Q. Will you look at Mr. Barnet's letter of May 25, 1943—the last paragraph of that letter?—A. "On further consideration I beg to offer the sum of eight hundred and twenty-five thousand ($825,000) dollars for the said lands on the terms and conditions set out in our leter of May 17." Yes.

Q. The terms and conditions. The adjustments were as of the end of May which would have permitted the custodian to retain all those rents—$41,000; is that correct?—A. That would be the effect.

Q. And he would be responsible for the taxes up to the end of May? —A. Of course, the taxes, I think, are due when they are assessed.

Q. No, you talk about adjustment. You know from your long experience you are adjusting on the basis of the broken period during the year; I think you and I agreed a while ago that the change in the assessment as between the 1st of January and June was worth about $25,000?—A. Yes, it would be; but the deal was still in the negotiation stage.

Q. Then, having offered $825,000 with adjustments set forth in the letter of May 17—that is adjustments at the end of May—you increased your offer to $850,000 and you changed the basis of adjustment?—A. Yes.

Q. Which had the effect in the result of reducing the $850,000 by $25,000?—A. In other words, it is about the same offer stated in a different way.

Q. Exactly. In other words, you have the property at $825,000 with relation to the former terms set out in the original offer?—A. Yes.

Q. It really was an offer of $825,000, and you got your second last offer accepted in another form?—A. Yes.

Q. And as to the $850,000, the extra $25,000 as compared with the offer of $825,000 which preceded it just does not mean that?—A. It means this much, that we took an assignment of $41,000 from the custodian and we paid it out in taxes for 1943.

Q. Apart from that, there was $850,000 on the terms eventually agreed upon compared with the $825,000?—A. There was not much difference.

Q. There was not any difference—a few cents. I am not suggesting it is your responsibility because you were looking after the purchaser's end of it; but the other $25,000 was just window dressing as far as the vendor was concerned.

Mr. JAENICKE: Mr. Chairman, we should have a copy of the matter that Mr. Fleming is referring to. I was given one copy but I was asked to return it. This is a matter that takes days of study. Why have we not a copy for our party?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: You have been treated exactly the same as Mr. Fleming. You have a member on the steering committee and he has been supplied with a copy, as I understand it.

Mr. BURTON: No, this correspondence that Mr. Jaenicke is referring to was supplied by the clerk but Mr. Jaenicke had to return it before he had time to go over it.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-69
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Mr. JAENICKE: I glanced over it; but this is a matter that would take days and days of study. I see that Mr. Fleming has his copy all marked up. I did not dare mark up my copy because I was told I had to return it.

The CHAIRMAN: I think if you apply to the clerk's office you will be able to get a copy, and you can mark it up if you like.

Mr. FLEMING: I got my copy on the same terms as others.

The committee adjourned at 1 p.m. to meet on Thursday, May 22, at 11.30 a.m.

SCI 17 46

SESSION 1947

HOUSE OF COMMONS

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 9

THURSDAY, MAY 22, 1947

WITNESSES:

Mr. Gordon Murchison, Director, Soldier Settlement and Veterans' Land Act;

Dr. E. H. Coleman, C.M.G., K.C., Deputy Custodian of Enemy Property; Mr. F. G. Shears, Director, Vancouver Office, and Mr. K. W. Wright, Counsel.

OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., B.A., L.Ph.,
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
1947

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-70
www.nikkeimuseum.org

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

THURSDAY, May 22, 1947.

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts met at 11.30 o'clock a.m., the Vice-Chairman, Mr. Gordon B. Isnor, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Boucher, Burton, Cleaver, Cote (*Verdun*), Cruickshank, Ferguson, Fleming, Fraser, Gladstone, Golding, Hamel, Isnor, Jackman, Jaenicke, Marshall, McCubbin, Pinard, Probe, Raymond (*Wright*), Smith (*Calgary West*), Stewart (*Winnipeg North*), Stuart (*Charlotte*), Warren, Winkler.

In attendance: Dr. E. H. Coleman, C.M.G., K.C., Deputy Custodian of Enemy Property, Mr. F. G. Shears, Director, Vancouver Office of the Custodian, and Mr. K. W. Wright, Counsel; Mr. Gordon Murchison, Director, Soldier Settlement and Veterans' Land Act.

The Committee resumer its investigation into the administration of the Vancouver office of the Custodian.

Examination of Mr. Murchison was continued.

Mr. Murchison retired.

Mr. Shears was recalled and questioned.

Mr. Shears filed a copy of Order in Council P.C. 469 of January 19, 1943, which, on motion of Mr. Pinard, was ordered to be printed as *Appendix "A"* to this day's minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Mr. Shears retired.

It was agreed that a representative of the Cooperative Committee on Japanese Canadians be heard at the next sitting.

At 1.10 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned until Tuesday, May 27, at 11.30 o'clock a.m.

A. L. BURGESS,
Clerk of the Committee.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-71
www.nikkeimuseum.org

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
May 22, 1947.

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts met this day at 11.30 a.m. Mr. Gordon B. Isnor, Vice-Chairman, presided.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Gentleman, would you be good enough to come to order. W have a quorum now and I wish to thank the members for being so punctual.

I have requested Mr. Murchison to appear again before the committee for further questioning. As I understand certain of the members desire to ask him further questions. I also have asked Mr. Shears to be present because of a question raised by Mr. Fleming at our last meeting. I understand that Mr. Murchison wishes to make a short statement before you begin questioning him.

Gordon B. Murchison, Director of the Soldier Settlement Board and the Veterans' Land Act, recalled:

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, it will be recalled that during the course of my evidence on Tuesday I was asked to supply the committee with details of the sale price of lands to veterans in order to complete the schedule which had been filed with the committee, by Mr. Shears. In that schedule the name of the former Japanese owner is given, the appraisal, and the sale price to the director. I think it was the wish of the committee that I should furnish as well the sale price of the same lands as sold to the veteran. Now that work is under way but it is not altogether a simple matter to get it ready because we have to make a search of approximately 1,000 files to obtain the actual legal descriptions of the land. Those legal descriptions are not included in the schedule of the land submitted by the custodian. The work is in hand but it will take some little time to procure the details and I can assure you that it will be forthcoming as quickly as possible. Our staff at this time of the year is generally loaded up with current work but as I say I can assure you this request is in hand and the information will be forthcoming as quickly as possible.

The other statement I wish to make this morning is a brief one. It is in regard to a report which appeared in the May 21 issue of the *Globe and Mail*. I feel, Mr. Chairman, that I am entitled in my official capacity to take at least some exception to the manner in which this article was developed. I realize, of course, that it is the right of any newspaper to develop his own material as he sees fit but after all I do feel in a matter of this kind the situation could have been placed before the public of Canada by this newspaper in a manner which follows more closely the chronological order of the evidence I gave last Tuesday. I feel that there has been a certain amount of what might be termed a practice of lifting from its context certain parts of the evidence and so developing the story that the true intent and meaning of what was stated has to a large extent been obscured. There are a few samples of this, such as the reference made in the opening part of the article (which opens and closes on the subject of what was realized on the sale of land to non-veterans.) It is stated "that Murchison

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-72
www.nikkeimuseum.org

gave the committee two examples of profits". I did not give two examples in that sense. I gave the committee a factual statement of all the sales that had been made to non-veterans with the details of each one. The article goes on to say "There are still 400 parcels of land which will be sold to the public if veterans do not take them up. Murchison admitted he was hoping to make further profit." Now that is not what I stated to the committee; first for the reason that the director of the Veterans' Land Act has no statutory authority to sell these lands to anyone without the approval of the Governor in Council; secondly I did not say I was hoping to make further profits. An observation was made by a member of the committee that if the few sales made to non-veterans was taken as an index, the department was in a position to make a profit. My statement was I would be happy to be in that position, which is an entirely different thing from I was hoping to make profits. Further on in the article there is a refernce to juggling lands around so that it was difficult for the director to furnish information to this committee as to the sale prices to veterans. Now I object, Mr. Chairman, to the word "juggling". There has been no juggling. As I explained quite frankly to this committee we found it desirable and good business to subdivide some of the larger parcels sold and to combine some of the smaller parcels in order to make suitable units. I object to the word juggling because it was ordinary sensible administration.

Mr. FERGUSON: May I ask Mr. Murchison what he means. He admits the statement "I will be happy if this profit is made", or "to be in that position"; "I would be glad to be in that position". Does he not mean what he says? That statement may be quite easily interpreted by the *Globe and Mail* to the effect that you would be happy to make a profit.

The WITNESS: I do not know what interpretation the *Globe and Mail* would put on it but I stated I would be happy to be in that position.

Mr. FERGUSON: You stated you would be happy for the government.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Is it your wish that the witness continue to make his statement?

Mr. CLEAVER: Yes, without interruption.

Mr. FERGUSON: Why without interruption?

Mr. CLEAVER: It is only ordinary common decency to the witness.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am going to make a suggestion. I suggest that we let the witness go on without interruption but I am going to suggest that the witness make similar comments on an article which appeared in the Toronto *Star* which was to the same effect. I think we had better cover the whole field if we are going to cover any of it.

The WITNESS: I have very few more comments to make but I do feel, when I am ordered to appear before a committee of the House of Commons or Senate that I am expected to state the facts and not present a scrambled story. Now I endeavoured very conscientiously last Tuesday to do that very thing and I feel a little distressed that a newspaper of the status of the *Globe and Mail* should publish an article which to me was certainly a scrambled article. It lifted things from the context and changed the order of presentation. That procedure created, I am sure, a different impression from what was created here last Tuesday. One illustration which I might mention was this. "The minutes of the advisory committee of a meeting of March 18, 1943 reveal that the Soldiers' Settlement representative, Mr. Barnet, had agreed to a stipulation that if the department made any profit on the land deal the excess should be paid back to the custodian for distribution to the Japanese owners".

Now there is not a thing wrong with that statement the way it is mentioned but the unsatisfactory part of it to me is it does not relate to the rest of the

minutes of the meeting of that advisory committee. That is an illustration of lifting a sentence or two from the context of the minutes of a very important meeting. In other words it is trying to create a situation where the representative of the director of the Veterans' Land Act in Vancouver, without any reference to head office at all, or to my responsible minister, was making a commitment on behalf of the dominion government which at that time he was not authorized to do. Had the writer of the article pursued the minutes further he would have seen that Mr. Barnet had qualified this, to the extent that it was subject to review by his superiors.

That is all I have to say, Mr. Chairman, but I do not feel that justice was done in this report.

Mr. SMITH: Well, would the witness now make similar comments on an article which appeared in the Toronto *Star*? It is to the same effect.

The WITNESS: I have not seen that article.

Mr. SMITH: I do not suppose so.

By Mr. Burton:

Q. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to enter the controversy that has arisen between Mr. Murchison and certain sections of the press but there is further information that I would like to have on the sale of these lands. When we adjourned at the last meeting it was already passed the hour of adjournment and there were some further questions that I had which I would like to ask Mr. Murchison now. Just to refresh your memory, Mr. Murchison, if I remember correctly at that time you informed us that in the year 1943 you had paid municipal taxes amounting to somewhat over $40,000, and that the rents acquired from those properties for you were in excess of the taxes, amounting to another $8,000 and that had been remitted to the Receiver General. The question I had intended to ask at that time if the adjournment had not interfered was this. In the sale price of those lands to the veterans were the taxes you had paid added to the price of the land that you were selling to the veterans?—A. No?

Q. They were not added to the price of the land?—A. No.

Q. Then in subsequent years there were other taxes that you had to meet? —A. That is right.

Q. And none of those accumulated taxes that your department had paid were added to the sale price charged the veteran?—A. No.

Q. And in arriving at your sale price of the land to the veteran did you use the basis of that $850,000 which you informed us at the previous meeting was the price that you had bought those lands from the custodian? In other words the sale price to the veteran was based on the $850,000?—A. That is right.

Q. And your rents and taxes did not enter into that part of it at all?—A. No sir.

Q. And in obtaining those lands for the sum of $850,000 you considered you had made a good buy for the veterans and you sold the land to the veterans for the same amount, as nearly possible, for which each parcel had been bought? —A. That is correct.

Q. In arriving at those figures for those different parcels would you mind just telling us how you made the breakdown between the selling of the individual parcels where you had bought them in a lump?—A. The difference between the appraised value and the price which was finally agreed upon, I stated the other day, was something like $17,000. That was allocated on a percentage basis over all the parcels involved. I think it required an average of 1·8 per cent reduction on the appraised value in order to establish the price at which it was actually bought.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-73
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Q. In buying this land which you bought in a lump there was a certain number of parcels. Then there were some parcels you disposed of to people other than veterans where you did realize a considerable amount more than what you had to pay for it. Now that money went to the Receiver General of Canada and it did not enter into lowering the price of the land you were selling to the veterans?—A. No sir.

Mr. CLEAVER: On the other hand, I do not suppose you charged the veteran any interest or carrying charges?

The WITNESS: No sir.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Mr. Chairman, there are one or two matters on which I would like to ask Mr. Murchison questions. I take it from the remarks you have made on the article in the *Globe* that you have read fully, since our last meeting, the minutes and the correspondence. I gathered at the last meeting that you were not familiar with them but I take it you have read them since?—A. I have read the relative parts of the custodian's meeting of March 18, 1943. I have not had time to read the balance of the minutes.

Q. We can proceed then, on that basis. You will recall that in the minutes of March 18, on page 2 reference is made to the fact that Mr. Barnet, who was your representative, indicated that the department had completed their survey and the appraisals had been made. Actually it had been completed a good many months before. He went on to say, as is recorded in the minutes, that he did not wish to disclose the value of any particular properties at that time. And then later, at the meeting of May 19, if you will just turn forward you will see that on the first page it says—

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: What is the page number?

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. It is not numbered but it is on the first page in the first long paragraph. Mr. McPherson is making a statement and he says "That while he had been advised of the amount of a total bulk offer, he had only received a few minutes prior to this meeting figures which related to each individual property".

That is referring to the figures of your appraisers which the committee apparently thought they ought to have through Mr. Barnet. Did Mr. Barnet have any instructions at this stage of the negotiations not to disclose to the committee the contents of the appraiser's report which had been received by your department? That is, was he not to disclose them to the custodian's committee?—A. Yes, I recall, if my memory is correct, in the inceptive stages of negotiations we did not feel that it was good practice on our part to disclose all the details of the appraisals we had made on those properties when we were concerned with the purchase. Subsequently that was modified and according to the best of my recollection the details of the appraisals were made available to the custodian.

Q. At a somewhat later date in the negotiations. Am I correct in inferring from the reading of the minutes that, when the negotiations began and the first offer was made, on instructions from your department your representatives did not disclose the appraiser's reports which they had made to your department.—A. I think that is right sir.

Q. And I take it the reason is, and I am just bringing out the facts, I am not quarrelling with your motive in doing so, your reason was that you were acting for a buyer and the custodian and his committee were acting for a seller and you were dealing at arm's length? You were not disclosing all of the information you had when you were dealing with him with a view to buying on the best terms you could get?—A. I think it is fair but I would not say that we were dealing at arm's length.

Q. Well is there any qualification you would like to make?—A. Well I would say there was some caution on our part at the inceptive stages in disclosing all the details we had in regards to the individual valuations.

Q. Is it fair to use the expression that, as you were purchasing this land you were not "tipping your hand" to the custodian and his committee who represented the vendors?—A. I think that is a fair statement.

Q. There is one other matter Mr. Murchison which arises from the minutes of the meeting of May 24, the sixth page.

Mr. BURTON: What page?

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. It is on the sixth page. Now let me say, just in explanation of my question, I am recalling Mr. Murchison, that at the Tuesday meeting you indicated you were not taking the responsibility for protecting the interests of the custodian. That was not your function. Now about half way down on that page you will see a paragraph which relates to a discussion of the negotiations and it was suggested that "if a deal was made some protection should be given to the custodian in the event that the Soldiers' Settlement of Canada resold any parcels of land at a price in excess of the value at which it had been purchased. The Veterans' Land Act committee were not prepared to consider this matter and it was decided that this might be a question to be decided at Ottawa."

Now did you have a report on that matter from your representative?—A. I do not recall offhand that I had a report on the specific matter. I mentioned that according to my best recollection Mr. Barnet was under general instructions from me to be very careful about making any further commitments with regard to future disposal of these lands if they were to be purchased by the Veterans' Land Act because we did not know how long we would have to hold them under administration. That was in 1943 when the war was at a very serious stage and I think it was only natural and prudent on my part to avoid any long-range commitments with respect to what would be done if the property were purchased. I say that applied not only with respect to the purchases from the Japanese but all over Canada.

Q. In short, Mr. Barnet in taking that position was acting under your instructions?—A. My general instructions.

Q. And you did not want any commitments attached to the purchase as far as you were concerned?—A. No.

Q. And if there was to be any attempt made to share with the Japanese owners any advance in price, that definitely was not to be the concern of your department and you were leaving that to the custodian?—A. Well that would be a matter of general government policy on which I was not competent to make any decision at that time.

Q. Was this matter the subject of any further discussion or instructions on the part of the minister to yourself—your minister?—A. Not according to my recollection. I think it is on the record that in the final stages of the transaction an offer in writing was prepared by our Vancouver superintendent at a price of $850,000 including certain conditions that were attached to the sale, one being the assignment of leases in existence; another being the refund to the director of the taxes collected by the custodian for the year 1943.

Q. Excuse me, but I think we have had all that before. The fact is that there was no reference to any commitment of this kind in the contract? You were saying there was no further discussion of that as far as you are aware, from the time this position was taken on your behalf by your representative at the meeting of May 24, 1943?—A. No.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-74
www.nikkeimuseum.org

By Mr. Jaenicke:

Q. I think you told us at the last meeting that you made your survey in 1942 by virtue of an order in council passed in January 1942; is that right?—A. No, it was passed in June 1942.

Q. I think you also told us that you made these appraisals not with a view to buying these lands; is that right?—A. That is right.

Q. Now, tell me if there has been a misunderstanding. I find in the minutes of the advisory board, the first meeting of March 15, Mr. McPherson explains to the advisory board his conversation with Mr. Barnet; is that it?—A. Yes.

Q. He is an official of your department. Mr. McPherson explains—and I quote from the minutes of that meeting—

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: What page?

Mr. JAENICKE: Page 6. I have marked this from beginning to end. It is on the first page of the minutes:

Frank G. Shears, Director of the Office of the Custodian, Vancouver, recalled:

By Mr. Jaenicke:

Q. Mr. Chairman, I wish to put on the record certain excerpts from the minutes which have been tabled so they might be printed in the proceedings. Mr. Shears might sit down because I have not very many questions to ask, but I should like to read some excerpts from the minutes and then ask Mr. Shears questions with respect to some of them.

I might also say I have carefully perused these minutes, and it is my opinion, so far as Mr. Shears is concerned, he has done a good job. Of course, he was acting under instructions. If there was anything not just right, if we came to the conclusion that these lands were sold for less than they should have been, I do not think the Vancouver office over which Mr. Shears presided had anything to do with it. I must pay him a compliment for the very fine way in which he has kept the minutes of the proceedings of the committee presided over by Judge Whiteside. I wish there were minutes of the other committee as well.

On page 3, I wish to read an extract from the minutes as follows:

> Mr. McPherson who had come in from Ottawa . . . in his introductory remarks outlined the history behind the present situation, explaining the developments whereby the custodian took over the administration of evacuee property . . . Mr. McPherson also explained that the Soldier Settlement of Canada were now anxious to obtain land for the re-settlement of returned men and that they desired to purchase a large percentage of the formerly owned Japanese land.

I am now turning to page 8.

> Mr. McPherson said that it was his understanding in the meetings held at Ottawa, at which the chairman attended, that it was definitely indicated that as a matter of policy it was the government's desire that the Soldier Settlement of Canada should have the first option to purchase any or all property if they so desired. Mr. McPherson pointed out, however, that while the Soldier Settlement of Canada had a first option to purchase, it did not necessarily follow that they could purchase at their price, that any sale to the Soldier Settlement of Canada would be for a reasonable price.

MARCH 15 1942 meeting Ayzer-vators not passed till June

Now, was that the first time, Mr. Shears, that you had any intimation that the V.I.A. was interested in purchasing this property?—A. Yes, that was the first time.

Q. How long before had you been keeping your office in Vancouver?—A. The evacuee section of the office, the first of March, 1942.

Q. Prior to that time you had just been administering the lands, that is renting the property and etc.?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, the minutes I have just read would indicate to you there were some negotiations in Ottawa prior to the meeting in Vancouver? I mean, there had been a meeting between the departments about purchasing this land. Would not the minutes I have just read indicate that?—A. Yes, they would indicate that.

Q. The next item I will not read because it was already dealt with by Mr. McPherson. It is a minute on page 8, where Mr. McPherson also explained that the obvious purpose of surveying had been to ascertain whether or not these lands would be suitable for the rehabilitation of returned men.

On page 10, there is the following quotation.

> Mr. McPherson advised the committee that he had been in touch with Mr. Barnet and Mr. Barnet had stated that they were considering purchasing approximately 75 per cent of all the rural lands with particular reference to the Fraser Valley and the Delta.

All this would indicate, Mr. Shears, that the committee was really set up to ascertain fair value of this land, was it not? That was really the purpose of setting up the advisory committee?—A. Yes.

Q. I should like to read from the minutes of the second meeting held in March, page 16—

Mr. FLEMING: I wonder if, to save a little time, since Mr. Jaenicke has indicated he proposes reading excerpts from these minutes—

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: That is good, you save a little time!

The CHAIRMAN: Order, gentlemen.

Mr. FLEMING: Mr. Jaenicke has indicated he proposes to read certain extracts from the minutes. I propose to do the same thing. Would it save time if, as Mr. Jaenicke is going along, we could have my excerpts entered at the same time. For instance, he has not included a couple of paragraphs on page 11 which I intended to quote.

Mr. JAENICKE: I suggest you put that in later. My ideas on these things are, perhaps, different from Mr. Fleming's ideas.

There was a second meeting held on March 18, 1943. At page 16.

> Mr. McPherson reported that immediately after the last meeting he contacted Mr. Barnet and discussed with him the question of the Soldier Settlement of Canada taking over a percentage of the farm lands. Mr. Barnet indicated that his department had completed their survey and knew approximately what properties they required and had estimated the values of same in so far as any purchases by that department was concerned. He, of course, did not wish to disclose the values of any particular properties at this time but agreed that if a sale could be negotiated he would be prepared to disclose the values after the custodian's valuators had made their survey and prices could then be compared and possibly a satisfactory price arbitrated with the approval of the committee.
>
> Mr. McPherson explained that a special order in council was passed giving them authority to make a survey of the Japanese agricultural lands and that it further provided that they had the right to veto any dealings

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-75
www.nikkeimuseum.org

with such land. The obvious purpose of this survey being to ascertain whether or not these lands would be suitable for the rehabilitation of returned men.

A. Yes.

Q. What have you to say about that?—A. As I pointed out to the committee on Tuesday, the purpose of the order in council was set out in that order in council. It authorized the director of Soldier Settlement to make an appraisal of these properties, and also placed the director of Soldier Settlement in control of the sale or lease of those properties during the life of that order in council.

Q. It says: "The obvious purpose of this survey being to ascertain whether or not these lands would be suitable for the rehabilitation of returned men."—A. I have no doubt that was a consideration; but the basic purpose of the order in council was to make an appraisal to determine as equitably as we could the equity of the Japanese people.

Q. Mind you, I do not make any objection to your stand, Mr. Murchison; I think it was your duty to make the best possible deal for the veterans; but I think that this committee is now considering the interest of the Japanese in this matter. That is all.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. May I go back to one point? I think from what you have already said, Mr. Murchison, that it follows naturally that when you made those three sales to persons other than veterans at prices, I think, in all cases in advance of those paid in the block offer, you did not make any report on those sales to the custodian?—A. No, I reported them to the Governor in Council.

Q. I am not saying whether you should or should not have; the fact of the matter is that you did not see any occasion to report that to the custodian? —A. No.

The Vice-Chairman: Are there any other questions?

By Mr. Cruickshank:

Q. Mr. Murchison, you endeavoured across Canada to buy property for the veterans, on behalf of the veterans, at as low a price as possible, did you not? —A. That was our effort.

The Vice-Chairman: Mr. Murchison—

Mr. Fleming: Nobody quarrels with that.

Mr. Cruickshank: Then I do not know what you are wasting all the time of this committee about.

Mr. Fleming: If it is not clear to my honourable friend he will learn by and by, if he keeps his ears open and uses another organ less.

Mr. Cruickshank: I do not have to take any abuse from any legal member from Toronto who has monopolized this whole meeting for political purposes.

By the Vice-Chairman:

Q. Mr. Murchison, arising out of questions asked by Mr. Burton, I wonder if you could clear up one point to my satisfaction? You stated that you purchased these individual parcels of land at certain prices and then sold them at the same price or as near as possible?—A. Yes.

Q. In the event of your having to carry the lands for some considerable time and pay taxes, insurance and other sundry expenses, how would you debit those amounts?—A. They would have to be covered by our administration vote and absorbed by the department as a whole. I did not charge these tax disbursements against the lands in establishing the sale price to the veteran. That would have been an unsatisfactory policy to follow because in buying land at that time we did not know how long we would have to hold it before we sold it, and by pyramiding the cost of the land by tax disbursements for quite a period it could quite easily create a situation where the sales price of the land for the veteran would be in excess of its value.

By Mr. Probe:

Q. Would not any one of these lands be producing revenue during the time of final disposal?—A. There was revenue; but unless I go into the details of the business I would say that the revenue received was not more than that required to meet ordinary carrying charges and taxes.

The Vice-Chairman: Gentlemen, if there are no further questions to be asked of this witness I will, with your approval, thank Mr. Murchison and release him. Now, Mr. Shears is here. Mr. Fleming, do you wish to ask any further questions of Mr. Shears?

Mr. Jaenicke: I do, Mr. Chairman.

The Vice-Chairman: Thank you very much, Mr. Murchison.

On page 17 there is the following quotation:—

> Mr. Barnet felt that the proposed calling for public tenders on all properties and then giving the Soldier Settlement of Canada an opportunity to meet any individual bid might considerably embarrass the Soldier Settlement of Canada and might nullify their interest in the program—

Mr. Shears, was there any particular reason given as to why, at that time, values should not be disclosed?

The Witness: No, I do not think there was anything, of necessity, being hidden at that time. It was simply this; an appraisal had been made by the Soldier Settlement Board which Mr. Barnet had. They were starting negotiations for the purchase of this property. So, before saying, "Here are your 700 odd parcels against which is the price we are prepared to pay," it was Mr. Barnet's idea that should not be disclosed until an advisory committee on behalf of the custodian, first of all, came to a conclusion that they would consider the group offer from the Department of Veterans' Land. Also, as indicated in the minutes, if the advisory committee of the custodian was going to make a valuation it would be better, in Mr. Barnet's judgment, they should not know the price it was intended to offer. First of all, the advisory committee, without knowing what the offer was, should obtain their own valuation.

By Mr. Jaenicke:

Q. Then, also on page 17,

> Mr. Barnet indicated to Mr. McPherson that having given the matter considerable thought he felt that the Soldier Settlement of Canada by purchasing a 100 per cent of the properties might be able to re-group same and have more units available for returned men than they might obtain by individual purchases. In addition to this, a re-grouping would result in their having certain farms available for resale and he agreed that if any profit was made by the Soldier Settlement of Canada on such resale, provided the sales were made within an agreed period, the amount of the profit would be paid over to the custodian for the account of the former Japanese owner.
>
> Mr. Barnet of course desires that it should be clearly understood by the committee that his opinion is not binding upon his department—

That is the point we discussed?—A. Yes. I do not want to throw out any misapprehensions here, and, in fairness to Mr. Barnet, it should be distinctly

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-76
www.nikkeimuseum.org

understood Mr. Barnet was not in attendance at any of these meetings. What you are reading from the minutes now is Mr. McPherson's view.

Q. From page 18, I wish to quote the following:—

> Mr. Barnet asked Mr. McPherson how the committee proposed to arrive at any values and Mr. McPherson stated that he thought the committee might be prepared to arrange for the making of spot valuations by taking a percentage of farms in each municipality—
>
> Mr. McPherson stated that as a result of his discussion with Mr. Barnet he had not prepared a public notice of the proposed sale, nor had he given instructions for the preparation of a catalogue as he was instructed to do at the last meeting of the committee.
>
> The chairman then called upon the members of the committee to express their opinion on the matter of the proposed 100 per cent sale.
>
> Mr. MacKenzie stated that he thought that since the custodian's policy generally was to advertise, if the custodian did not do so in this case, giving the public at least a chance to bid the committee might be subject to considerable criticism . . . he was also of the opinion that there were many people waiting for the opportunity of buying this land and that they should be given an opportunity to do so.

Were there any offers received, any unsolicited offers received by your office for the sale of this land, Mr. Shears?—A. No, I would say not. It might be possible that some people had written in about the purchase of land, but they were not given any consideration until after this particular deal had been consummated. It was a month or two later than that that the properties generally were advertised and tenders called. No individual sale had been made by the custodian previous to that.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jaenicke may I suggest to you, in all fairness, if you are quoting Mr. McPherson, you should complete the paragraph. I am not unmindful of what you said to Mr. Fleming.

Mr. JAENICKE: I do not want to be misinterpreted. I quoted the paragraph in which Mr. Barnet stated it was clearly understood his opinion was not binding upon his department. I tried to be very fair and not try to pick out certain extracts.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not want to go all over this to put in the balance of the statements by Mr. McPherson, but I think the second portion of that paragraph you quoted has a direct bearing and would explain the reason for the first statement. If you do not wish to follow that policy, it is all right, but I thought I would suggest it to you.

Mr. JAENICKE: I have not all the minutes before me. I do not know what the paragraph is, but it is certainly satisfactory to me.

Mr. CLEAVER: Following out your suggestion, Mr. Chairman, might it not be wise if, on any occasion the witness believes an additional sentence or concluding paragraph should be added, to have the witness do that?

Mr. JAENICKE: I can assure the committee I am not doing this for any political purpose whatever. I believe we should be fair to the Japanese.

The CHAIRMAN: And to Mr. McPherson as well.

Mr. JAENICKE: I wish to be fair to all the officials.

Mr. PINARD: This paragraph to which the chairman was referring might be added now by the witness.

The WITNESS: "Mr. Barnet asked Mr. McPherson how the committee proposed to arrive at any values and Mr. McPherson stated that he thought the committee might be prepared to arrange for the making of spot valuations by taking a percentage of farms in each municipality and that prices valued in

this way could then be prepared with the valuations of the Soldier Settlement of Canada and the percentage of difference estimated, and if agreed upon, such percentage could be added to the total purchase price."

Mr. JAENICKE: Yes, I mentioned something like that previously. I come to that later, anyway. You refer in these minutes to a 100 per cent sale; what does that mean?

The WITNESS: That meant a 100 per cent sale of farm land in the Fraser Valley area.

By Mr. Jaenicke:

Q. One hundred per cent of the parcels or 100 per cent of the— —A. Of the Japanese owned farm lands.

Q. Yes, but 100 per cent of the parcels or 100 per cent of the valuation of the S.S.B.?—A. It was really 100 per cent of the Japanese owned land in the valley with the exception, as has been pointed out by some member of the committee previously, there were a relatively few properties in that area which were somewhat expensive properties which were not suitable for the purposes for which these lands were being negotiated.

Q. On page 22 Mr. MacKenzie stated,—I will just read this into the record to show the attitude of some members of the committee.

> Mr. MacKenzie stated that one of the principal objects of the committee was to see that there should be British fair play and that was the basis upon which he was prepared to consider the question and Mr. Yamaga could be assured that the committee would see that everything possible was done to protect the Japanese interests in their property.

What do they mean by "protecting Japanese interests"?—A. The advisory committee of the custodian was set up to give advice to the custodian and the custodian was there in the position of representing the Japanese evacuees. To that extent, I would say that the advisory committee did always have in mind the fair interest of the Japanese.

Q. So, what was meant was that a fair price should be obtained for the Japanese?—A. Yes, definitely.

Q. Now, I have some extracts from the minutes of the meeting held on May 19. I am reading from pages 25 and 26.

> Mr. McPherson outlined the work that had been going on in Ottawa in regard to the Soldier Settlement of Canada. . . .
>
> Mr. McPherson stated that the offer received was for $750,000. As previously mentioned he had only just obtained the statements which showed the basis on which this offer was made and that the statements were supplied on the condition that copies were not made.

On page 26 there is the following:

> The offer covered 769 parcels.

Later, on the same page, there is the following:

> The revenue from these lands at present under lease was approximately $83,000.
>
> Mr. McPherson mentioned that the Soldier Settlement of Canada had appraised all these lands in 1942 upon the instructions of their minister and Mr. Barnet stated at that time they did not know it was being done with a view to purchasing these lands.
>
> Mr. McPherson said that he was placing this offer before the committee but that he did not wish to express any opinion as to whether he agreed with it or not. He thought that the committee should decide how they wished to check these valuations of the Soldier Settlement of Canada.

Source: Nikkei National Museum 20181614515-77
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Again, no copies were to be made. At that time, were valuations of the Soldier Settlement Board disclosed to the members of the committee?—A. This is the third meeting, is it?

Q. It is the third meeting on May 19.—A. Yes.

Q. I presume when Mr. McPherson talks about a statement supplied on condition copies were not made, it refers to the valuation by the Soldier Settlement Board?—A. Precisely.

Q. Were the members of the committee given copies of it or were they advised of the valuations at that time?—A. There was one copy lying on the table. It listed the 769 parcels and the values were placed opposite.

Q. Was there any promise made by the members not to disclose the values if they had seen them or something to that effect?—A. No, I do not recollect that.

Q. Then, on page 27— —A. Just a moment, it is suggested I should read something in addition to what you have just quoted.

> Mr. McPherson said he was placing this offer before the committee but that he did not wish to express any opinion as to whether he agreed with it or not. He thought that the committee should decide how they wished to check the valuations of the Soldier Settlement of Canada. He suggested that Mr. Yamaga's property might be used as an example and he asked Mr. Yamaga what he would consider a fair price for his property so that it could be compared with the Soldier Settlement of Canada's valuation. Mr. Yamaga said it depended upon the date the valuation was taken. If it was taken before May last, he would include his crop of raspberries and strawberries, thereby increasing the price by a few hundred dollars, but he thought about $2,000 would be a fair valuation. Reference to the Soldier Settlement's statement showed their appraisal to be $1,614.

Q. I did not include that because we have, later on, the independent appraisal of the 17 parcels which I should like to place in evidence. I believe it works out to be about the same as Mr. Yamaga's figure.

On page 27,

> The chairman suggested that it might be well to have a subcommittee go out and value certain properties, taking a few from each municipality, and he suggested Mr. MacKenzie, Mr. Menzies and Mr. Yamaga could do this and report back to the committee at its next meeting and this was agreed to.

That committee was appointed and then went out to make its valuations, isn't that right?—A. Yes.

Q. They made their report on May 24?—A. Yes.

Q. It is in the meeting of May 24 that you have the first letter from the Soldier Settlement of Canada offering $750,000 for the 769 parcels of land, upon certain conditions contained in that letter?—A. Yes.

Q. I think we should have this letter on the record. Mr. Fleming, I believe, wants it on the record.—A. This is the letter from Mr. I. T. Barnet, District Superintendent to the Custodian of Japanese property in the protected area in British Columbia, Vancouver, May 17, 1943. It is the one which commences:

> On behalf of the directors—

By Mr. Pinard:

Q. What was the offer in that letter?—A. $750,000.

Mr. PINARD: If the offer was increased, I do not see the necessity for filing the letter.

Mr. JAENICKE: The terms were in that letter.

Mr. PINARD: Due to the fact the offer was increased, I do not see the necessity for filing it.

Mr. JAENICKE: It came out in one of our meetings that there was a second offer then a third offer was made and the third offer, which was accepted, was not as good as the second offer. I referred to the terms in this letter.

Mr. FLEMING: I think it would be just as well to have this letter go in if there is no objection to it. I referred to this letter in my questioning of Mr. Murchison at the last meeting. I think the letter should go in.

Mr. PINARD: I do not wish to enter any objection.

(The letter follows):

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT OF CANADA

518 Rogers Building,
VANCOUVER, B.C., May 17, 1943.

The Custodian of Japanese Properties
in the Protected Area in British
Columbia, Vancouver, B.C.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of the Director, the Veterans' Land Act, and subject to Ottawa approval, I beg to submit an offer to purchase seven hundred and sixty-nine (769) parcels of land, together with all existing buildings and other improvements, tree, bush fruits, etc., growing thereon, more particularly described in the attached schedules (errors and omission excepted), and formerly occupied by persons of the Japanese race at and for the aggregate sum of Seven hundred and Fifty thousand ($750,000) Dollars subject to the following conditions:

(1) Delivery of title fee simple in the name of the Director, the Veterans' Land Act, free from all encumbrances and setting forth legal boundaries in terms acceptable to the Director, and the Registrar of Land Titles for the district in which the land is situated; delivery of titles to be completed by August 31, 1943;

(2) All taxes and charges to be paid or adjusted to May 31, 1943;

(3) Assignment to the Director, the Veterans' Land Act, of all leases and unpaid rentals as at May 31, 1943;

(4) Assignment to the Director, the Veterans' Land Act, of all existing fire insurance policies adjusted to May 31, 1943; (b) In the event of buildings having been removed, or destroyed by fire, subsequent to the appraisal made in 1942, the gross offer is to be reduced by the amount of the appraised value of the said buildings as established by the Director, the Veterans' Land Act;

(5) In the event of the Custodian being unable to deliver titles to any of the lands listed in the attached schedules, the gross offer herein is to be reduced by the amount of the appraised value of such lands as established by the Director, the Veterans' Land Act, in the appraisal reports made in 1942;

(6) Possession upon delivery of titles subject only to condition number three (3) above;

(7) Acceptance of this offer, in writing, within thirty (30) days.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) I. T. BARNET,
District Superintendent.

§322—2

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-78
www.nikkeimuseum.org

By Mr. Jaenicke:

Q. Then, I wish to refer to the report of the subcommittee appointed to appraise the 17 properties. There are 17 properties which the committee valued at $13,100 and the S.S.B. valuation was $28,232. I find there are two appraisals made by the S.S.B. which are higher than the committee's and those are in the municipality of Mission. I may say there were four parcels in the municipality of Surrey, five in Maple Ridge, four in Mission, two in Pitt Meadows and two in Matsqui.

The minutes read as follows:

> It was noted that the valuation made by the committee was approximately 50 per cent above that offered by the Soldier Settlement of Canada.

A. If you would permit me, for the purpose of the record, I should like to say that this valuation was made—is the date specified? In any event, it would be May or June of 1943, and the reference to the Soldier Settlement valuation would, of course, take it back to May of 1942.

Q. The committee's valuation was made a little less than a year, say about ten months, after the Soldier Settlement valuation was made?—A. Yes.

Q. On page 32 of the minutes there is the following:

> The chairman then asked for consideration to be given to the price and terms offered by the Soldier Settlement of Canada.
>
> The feeling of all the members of the committee was that the offer was too low. Mr. MacKenzie pointed out that their committee had made what they considered a conservative valuation of the 17 properties which they had inspected and some members of the subcommittee considered that their valuations could have been somewhat higher.

I have no questions to ask on that. I just put it in as an observation.

I read from the next page,

> At this point Mr. McPherson mentioned that the Regional Committee of the Veterans' Land Act were at present meeting in New Westminster and that it might be possible to invite them to the meeting and discuss their offer.

Later, on page 34, the minutes apparently show the arrival of the committee.

> At this point representatives of the Regional Board of the Veterans' Land Act joined the meeting. The following attended:
>
> Mr. T. Godfrey
> Mr. E. Carneross
> Mr. J. J. MacLennan.

There is an excerpt I wish to read from page 35 of the minutes.

> After considerable discussion the advisory committee indicated that they might be prepared to accept an offer of $900,000 cash. Mr. Godfrey, on behalf of the Veterans' Land Committee stated that they would be prepared to offer $800,000. The chairman suggested that it might be well for the two committees to consider a compromise of $850,000.

I presume, Mr. Shears, there was considerable discussion between the two committees?—A. Yes, there was.

Q. You would have a difficult time noting the different persons' opinions and observations at that time?—A. Yes. I think this meeting lasted for two or three hours and this is really the meat of the discussion.

Q. You suggest that the advisory committee was prepared to accept $900,000 cash. Can you recollect as to whether that was a unanimous opinion or decision of the advisory committee?—A. It was not put to a vote.

Q. I am asking for your opinion; do you think it was unanimous or did Mr. Yamaga object?—A. No, Mr. Yamaga did not specifically object at this meeting.

215

By Mr. Stewart (Winnipeg North):

Q. He was at this meeting, was he?—A. He was there at this meeting, I will just check up, but I feel sure he was. Yes, Mr. Yamaga was there.

Q. The advisory committee tried to get the best possible price, I presume, and the soldiers' representatives tried to get the smallest possible price?—A. Yes.

Q. And no decision was made at that meeting?—A. No, not at that meeting.

Q. Then in the extracts of the meeting of the 1st of June, on page 36 there is a letter from Mr. Yamaga to his honour Judge Whiteside which I will read into the record:

> VANCOUVER, B.C.,
> May 26, 1943.
>
> Hon. Judge WHITESIDE,
> Chairman of Advisory Committee
> for Liquidation of Japanese Property,
> New Westminster, B.C.
>
> Honourable SIR: Judging from the atmosphere of the meeting held on 24 May at Mr. McKenzie's office New Westminster I fear the outcome of the Custodian's negotiation with Soldier Settlement Board seems to bring unfair result to the Japanese owners and continuation of my service is no longer necessary.
>
> Therefore I tender my resignation as a member of your committee.
>
> Yours truly,
>
> (*Sgd.*) Y. YAMAGA."

Now with respect to the "atmosphere" of the meeting of the 24th of May was there a tendency to give in to the Soldiers Settlement people?—A. No, I would say the only possible reference there was a suggestion that some offer of less than the value of the Soldier Settlement Board would be given consideration. I think it is fair to say here this letter came as a surprise to the committee when it was received. I mean to say that it was the feeling of the advisory committee, by and large, that Mr. Yamaga was not only in favour of the principle but that he did not express any radical opposition to the way the matter was being conducted. I do admit this letter would belie that statement.

Q. Now then there is a letter on page 38 from Mr. McPherson to Mr. Barnet. I do not know whether anyone else wants the whole letter put on the record but it is simply an explanation by Mr. McPherson to Mr. Barnet as to the happenings in the committee and he indicated the committee would be pleased to recommend an offer of $1,000,000 with ten per cent reduction.

Mr. FLEMING: For cash?

Mr. JAENICKE: Yes, for cash.

Mr. FLEMING: I suggest that the whole letter go in.

Mr. JAENICKE: I was only picking out the last paragraph but if the whole letter goes in it is fine with me. On the same date Mr. Barnet wrote Mr. McPherson a letter, that is on page 38 and I presume that letter can go in.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed that both letters shall go in?

Agreed.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-79
www.nikkeimuseum.org

25th May, 1943.

Mr. I. T. Barnet,
The Soldier Settlement of Canada,
Rogers Building,
Vancouver, B.C.

Re: Japanese Agricultural Lands

Dear Sir: I have your letter of May 25 and your suggestion that I should advise you what offer the Custodian's committee is prepared to accept.

It is, of course, understood that the Custodian's committee will only recommend that the Custodian accept a satisfactory offer, and on this basis I would advise you that the committee indicated that they would be prepared to recommend acceptance of an offer of $1,000,000 with a possible reduction of 10 per cent for cash. I would appreciate your advice as to whether or not you are prepared to make an amended offer which could be submitted to the Custodian's committee for their further consideration.

In the discussions yesterday the committee were advised that the Soldier Settlement of Canada are considered as official appraisers for various government departments, and in view of this expressed the opinion that your offer should at least be in the neighbourhood of your own appraised value, which they believe to be $867,000. I am of the personal opinion that if you make an offer of approximately somewhere between $850,000 and $900,000 the committee would be prepared to give it at least favourable consideration.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) W. G. McPHERSON,
Executive Assistant.

Soldier Settlement of Canada
518 Rogers Building,

Vancouver, B.C., May 25, 1943.

G. W. McPherson, Esq.,
Custodian of Enemy Property,
675 Hastings Street, W.,
Vancouver, B.C.

Japanese Agricultural Lands

Dear Sir: I have for acknowledgment your letter of May 25 in which you indicate that you believe your committee is prepared to favourably consider an offer in the neighbourhood of $850,000.

You will recall that when you first invited an offer on these lands I expressed the opinion that we would only be interested in a part of them and, when your committee was so informed, they indicated that favourable consideration would be given if an offer was received en bloc apart from schools, churches, co-operative plants, etc.

It has always been an accepted fact that the buyer who takes a large block of properties is entitled to discount for cash of from at least ten to twenty-five per cent. I am advised by my regional advisory committee that they offered your committee $800,000 yesterday for these lands in an attempt to close the transaction.

On further consideration I beg to offer the sum of Eight Hundred and Twenty-five Thousand ($825,000) Dollars for the said lands on the terms and conditions set out in our letter of May 17.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) I. T. BARNET,
District Superintendent.

Mr. Jaenicke: Then there is a letter on page 40 from Mr. McPherson to Mr. Murchison.

The Witness: You mean Mr. Murchison to Mr. McPherson do you not?

Mr. Jaenicke: Yes, I am sorry, from Mr. Murchison to Mr. McPherson. It is dated May 29. Do you want that letter to go in?

Mr. Fleming: It may as well.

The Vice-Chairman: I should think it should go in.

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT AND VETERANS' LAND ACT

Office of the Director

Ottawa, May 29, 1943.

G. W. McPherson, Esq.,
Executive Assistant, Office of the Custodian,
Department of the Secretary of State,
Ottawa.

Dear Mr. McPherson,—I have received your letter of the 28th instant advising me that the custodian is not prepared to accept our offer of $825,000 for the lands more particularly described in the schedules which accompanied our original offer in writing, dated May 17.

Advice received from Mr. Barnet at Vancouver indicates that your Vancouver committee consider these particular lands are worth approximately one and one-quarter million dollars, and I may advise you frankly that the director, the Veterans' Land Act, is not interested in these lands at that figure.

My position in this matter differs materially from that of an ordinary purchaser for the following reasons:

1. A firm offer for cash has been made for 769 parcels of property and I have no reason to believe there is any other single agency or person in the market for that number of parcels.

2. Our appraisement of these lands was made on the basis of ordinary terms of sale and without regard to any temporary boom or speculative values brought about by a state of war. The offer which has been made represents only a minor cash discount on our valuations, and in ordinary land transactions a fair discount on ordinary terms for cash purchase is not uncommon.

3. The buildings on many of these properties are of cheap construction. Many of them are in poor repair and subject to more than ordinary risks of depreciation.

4. The offer to purchase these lands is made for the purpose of using them for the re-establishment of Canadian veterans after the war. Few of these properties can be used for this purpose without additional expenditure for the repair of existing buildings or the erection of new homes suitable for the occupation of a Canadian veteran and his family.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-80
www.nikkeimuseum.org

5. No one knows when the war will end, but if the lands are acquired now I must assume responsibility for the cost of administration, annual taxes, fire insurance, and depreciation, with no definite assurance that revenue from these lands will meet ordinary carrying charges.

As stated above, the director is not interested in acquiring these lands at the values which seem to exist in the minds of at least some of the members of your Vancouver committee, but with a view to closing this transaction, I am prepared to increase our latest offer by $25,000 to a total of $850,000, subject to the same terms and conditions which were set out in our written offer on May 17. This is the final offer I am prepared to make for these particular properties in bulk.

I would appreciate your final decision in this matter at your earliest convenience.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) G. MURCHISON,
Director.

Mr. JAENICKE: And the part I am drawing to your attention is this "I am prepared to increase our latest offer by $25,000 to a total of $850,000 subject to the same terms and conditions as set out in our written offer of May 17."

Then on page 41 we have a portion of the minutes which I think is rather singular. The committee stated the reasons as to why they would accept the offer and I should like to put this on the record and I quote from the minutes.

Mr. FLEMING: Would you read the whole motion? I think the extract should be given at the top of the page where it says "after the committee had discussed," etc.

After the committee had discussed the correspondence and the amended offer.

It was moved by Mr. MacKenzie and seconded by Mr. Menzies—

That having duly considered the revised offer of the Soldier Settlement of Canada for the purchase of 769 parcels of land with all existing buildings and other improvements, trees, bush fruits, etc., more particularly described in the attached schedules and formerly occupied by persons of the Japanese race for the sum of Eight Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars ($850,000).

Having in view:

(a) That this committee concurs in the policy of liquidation of Japanese properties in the Protected Area of British Columbia as provided for in order in council P.C. 469.

(b) The purpose for which such lands are required.

(c) That the offer is not for selected individual parcels but for a block of 769 parcels which include a large proportion of uncultivated land and a considerable amount of bush land.

(d) That while the appraisals of 17 farms made by this committee were in excess of the appraisals of the Soldier Settlement of Canada that it was realized that present values are enhanced due to war conditions and do not represent ordinary land values as in normal times.

(e) That the present offer is for cash and can therefore be reasonably expected to be less than the appraised value in view of the interest which may accrue by investment of the purchase funds.

(f) That the Custodian will be relieved of the cost of administration, taxes, fire insurance, depreciation.

This committee is therefore of the opinion that the offer of Eight Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars ($850,000) is fair and reasonable and recommends to the Custodian the acceptance of same subject to the terms of their offer.

The vote on this resolution was unanimous and it was agreed that the offer and recommendation should be written in the minutes and signed by the committee and a copy be supplied to each member for his own record.

By Mr. Jaenicke:

Q. Consideration all of these clauses, *a*, *b*, *c*, *d*, *e*, and *f* does that not sound something like an apology for having accepted an offer that was not really a good one?—A. This was the conclusion which the committee arrived at and there was justification for recommending to the custodian that the offer be accepted.

Q. It appears there was some verbal discussion and then there is also a letter on record from the secretary of state, Mr. McLarty, to Mr. Murchison, dated June 22, 1943 and this letter defines the terms that were changed and I would like to have this letter on the record. It is on page 44.

OTTAWA, June 23, 1943.

GORDON MURCHISON ESQ.,
Director, Veterans' Land Act,
Ottawa, Canada.

Re: Japanese Evacuee Lands

Dear Sir,—Your offer to purchase seven hundred and sixty-nine (769) parcels of land for eight hundred and fifty thousand ($850,000) dollars, subject to the terms and conditions set forth in your Mr. Barnet's letter of May 17, as amended by your letter of May 29, is hereby accepted subject to the following conditions which I understand Mr. McPherson has discussed with you and with which you agree. These conditions are as follows:

1. All taxes, charges and fire insurance for the crop year of 1943 will be assumed by you.

2. All rents paid or payable for the crop year 1943 will be assigned to you less such adjustments as may be necessary to take care of any taxes, charges or fire insurance paid for the 1943 crop year.

3. All existing lease agreements covering the lands included in your offer will be assigned to you by a general assignment, you already having duplicate copies of all such leases.

I would appreciate receiving a letter from you confirming these variations in the conditions of your offer.

Yours very truly,

(*Sgd*) N. A. McLARTY
Secretary of State.

Q. The point which I would bring out is contained in the paragraph which reads:

All rents paid or payable for the crop year 1943 will be assigned to you less such adjustments as may be necessary to take care of any taxes, charges or fire insurance paid for the 1943 crop year.

You heard Mr. Murchison's evidence at the last meeting?—A. Yes.

Q. And he seems to claim he got a better deal with $850,000 with adjustments of rent and so on than he would have in the offer of $825,000? Do you agree with that?—A. All I can say in that connection is that it was only at this time that the Vancouver office received word of the final arrangements

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-81
www.nikkeimuseum.org

which had been made. A copy of Mr. McLarty's letter was sent to the Vancouver office indicating that the deal was to be made on the basis of $850,000 and adjustments were to be made as of January 1, 1943.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: It is agreed that this letter shall go in?

Agreed.

Mr. FLEMING: I think that the letter is already on the record. It was put in by Mr. Shears at a previous meeting.

Mr. BURTON: It will be just as well to have it put in here.

Mr. FLEMING: For continuity.

By Mr. Jaenicke:

Q. Your committee was not consulted regarding the terms of sale?—A. Not at that date.

Q. As far as you were concerned you were selling at $850,000 and the adjustment was to be made as of May?—A. That was the committee's recommendation.

Q. On page 64 there is one little paragraph that I would like to put on the record. It is an extract from the minutes of the meeting held on January 13, 1944.

Mr. FLEMING: Did you say page 64?

Mr. JAENICKE: Yes.

> Mr. Shears referred to a recent visit he had made to Ottawa and advised the committee that it was now the wish of the custodian that in view of the fact that the director, the Veterans' Land Act was not likely to be interested in any further properties that an orderly liquidation of the balance of the properties vested in the custodian should be proceeded with.

What did you have in mind by "an orderly liquidation"?—A. Just this, and I think this should go on the record. The Soldiers' Settlement appraisal or the order in council authorizing it was made in June of 1942. There was order in council, P.C. 469 of the 19th of January 1943 which, for the first time, clarified the custodian's powers to include a policy of liquidation. Up to that time, although it was set out under order in council it was not the policy of the custodian to liquidate any property. The first liquidation of properties was this deal which at this stage had been consummated with the director of the Veterans' Land Act. That, being completely out of the way, advice was then received that it would be in order now, under P.C. 469, to proceed with the sale of the other properties to individuals and therefore you have the use of the expression, "orderly liquidation".

Mr. PINARD: If I may interject, you have referred to P.C. 469 which has not been tabled. I suggest that it also be put in the record.

By Mr. Jaenicke:

Q. Mr. Shears, I am not laying any blame on you whatsoever. I think you have done a good job but this word "orderly", does it not imply that the other liquidation was "disorderly" at least; or extraordinary?—A. The difference was as follows. Here was a group sale which had been made and I came to the committee and I passed on the information that the rest of the properties should be sold and that they were to be sold under the management of myself as director of the office and that it was to be proceeded with in an orderly manner. That would then bring in the question of the advertising and the calling for tenders and so on, matters which have all been referred to before this committee.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Do you think the expression "continued orderly manner", would be better?

The WITNESS: Yes.

By Mr. Cruickshank:

Q. I wonder if Mr. Shears has information as to the total acreage of those Japanese farms?—A. I am awfully sorry that I have not, sir. It has been established that there were approximately 10,000 acres involved in this particular deal.

Q. Have you any idea as to how many acres were under cultivation and how many acres were mountainous and on the side of hills? I wonder if you could tell us that for the benefit of my long-haired friends who have not seen a berry-farm?—A. In this particular deal, as I said, there were about 10,000 acres of which about 4,000 were cultivated.

Q. Have you any idea how many acres were on the side of hills and mountains and so on?—A. I have driven through the country and I have seen that quite a few of them are on the side of hills.

Q. You are familiar with what I am referring to?—A. They are on the sides of hills, yes.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Are you through Mr. Cruickshank?

By Mr. Cruickshank:

Q. What I am driving at, Mr. Chairman, is this. The valuations are being questioned, the values of these farm lands at that time and at later periods, and I am asking Mr. Shears if he agrees that at that time there was no demand for this class of land on the general market? Is that correct as far as you know?—A. As far as I am aware there had been no keen demand for those properties at that time.

Q. Then you will agree, I presume, that class of land requires a lot of labour?—A. That is definitely true.

Q. And do you agree that at that time the labour was not available in the province of British Columbia? What I am driving at Mr. Chairman, is this. I think there is no dispute about it. If this land had been thrown on the open market it would not have been in great demand, except in one or two cases.

Mr. JAENICKE: That is not borne out by the minutes.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: It may not be borne out by the minutes but it may be borne out by some of us who belong to British Columbia.

Mr. STEWART: It is certainly not what I have gathered.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Are you questioning the veracity of this gentleman and the evidence before this committee?

Mr. STEWART: I am going to take what I see in the minutes and I have my own idea of what you say.

By Mr. Cruickshank:

Q. I made the statement that this class of farm land was not in demand in that period. Am I not correct in that Mr. Shears?—A. I could not answer that question because as far as the custodian was concerned it had not been put to any proof at all. It had not been tested out. I will say this however, when the Japanese were evacuated, in cooperation with the Pacific Cooperative Union and other unions, tenants were put on all these farms and many of them turned out to be not particularly satisfactory tenants.

Mr. JAENICKE: But you did collect $83,000 in rentals for that period, or approximately that amount?

The WITNESS: The rentals were about that much.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: In my opinion, coming from that district, these farms were not in demand at that time. Also I do not think the class of labour was available to farm the farms at that time. In other words, if you get $100

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-82
www.nikkeimuseum.org

an acre for a piece of land at that time, and I am using the $100 only as a figure of speech, two years later you might have got $200. I think you will agree that is fair.

Mr. FLEMING: May I, for the benefit of my friend, the honourable member from Fraser Valley who has seen a berry-farm, read an extract from page 31 of these minutes which reads: "In reply to an enquiry from Mr. Yamaga, Mr. Shears stated that the 769 properties contain a total acreage of 9,859 acres of which 3,959 acres were cultivated and that the total assessed value was $1,225,703".

That is just read in passing, but to complete the record may I cover four or five extracts which I think have not been read and which I think ought to go in to complete the record. The first extract is on page 11.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Will you give the full quotation in each case, Mr. Fleming?

Mr. FLEMING: Yes. This is from the minutes of the meeting of March 15, 1943 and it begins:

> In order that the work of the committee might not be delayed, a general discussion took place as to the best method of advertising and the policy adopted by the custodian in the liquidation of motor vehicles, where a general advertisement was published and a catalogue prepared for examination, was considered and it was felt that subject to the decision of the Soldier Settlement of Canada, this might be a suitable policy to adopt in this case.
>
> Mr. MacKenzie expressed the opinion that all sales should be for cash although he was of the opinion that such a ruling by the committee might result in considerable curtailment in the number of sales.
>
> As to the method of valuing the property, Mr. McPherson pointed out that the Soldier Settlement of Canada had surveyed the property and valued same but that their values were as prospective purchasers and not vendors.

I turn now to page 19, an extract from the minutes of the meeting of March 18:

> Mr. McPherson explained that the reasons why the Custodian adopted a policy of advertising enemy property were first to ascertain the market value, and thereby have an answer for the enemy owner as to the value received for his property, and secondly to avoid any criticism by the public that by private sales individual persons in Canada had been given priority over the public generally. He pointed out that this policy was not to be interpreted that the Custodian recognized that any individual in Canada had any right to buy property from the Custodian or to demand that sales be made by public notice. He also pointed out that in many cases sales were made to government departments, provincial and dominion at appraised values without any public notice being given where it was considered that articles for sale could be of use in Canada's war effort. For example, the sale of motor vehicles to the R.C.M. Police prior to the publication of a notice calling for tenders generally.
>
> Mr. McPherson stated that a sale to the Soldier Settlement of Canada could not be critized by any individual on the grounds that he had a right to bid against the Soldier Settlement of Canada and he was of the definite opinion that for patriotic reasons no private citizen in Canada could complain of a sale to the Soldier Settlement of Canada, the purpose of such sale being to rehabilitate returned soldiers. He suggested to the committee that in considering the desirability of adopting a policy of a bulk sale to the Soldier Settlement of Canada they should keep in mind the fact that the Custodian as a trustee for the Japanese evacuees is not primarily concerned with any supposed rights of white people to purchase their lands.

Then, on page 27, an extract from the minutes of the meeting of May 19. There was an extract read from this page, but I should like to read this portion to complete the paragraph.

> Mr. Mackenzie said that he could not understand why Mr. Barnet did not wish copies of his figures to be made.

May I interpolate at this point, this goes back to the discussion as to why the appraisals from the Soldier Settlement Board were not made available to the committee.

> He thought that each member of the committee should have a copy so as to be able to make a thorough check. However, Mr. McPherson suggested that in order to get an independent valuation the farms should be valued without seeing the list received from Mr. Barnet.

Then, on page 34, a sentence or two was read from this page, but I think the balance of the page ought to be read. The extract which was read was to this effect:

> At this point representatives of the Regional Board of the Veterans' Land Act joined the meeting.

This is the meeting, Mr. Chairman, of May 24. "The following attended; then, it gives the names of the three men. The minutes then read as follows:

> Mr. Godfrey outlined the methods under which they had made their appraisals and that the appraisers were considered to be exceedingly well qualified. He stated that their appraisals were not made by snap judgment but after thorough investigation and survey and he stated that valuations had not been made with the idea that the Soldier Settlement of Canada would be prospective purchasers and that he considered their offer of $750,000 very fair.
>
> Mr. Carneross also stated that the appraisers were well known to him and were trained and experienced men. He stated that if the war continued, revenues would be offset by taxes, depreciation and administration costs. While he believed the appraisers' values of $867,000 could be considered an accurate and fair valuation, it included a lot of property which would be unsuitable for their purpose and require a great amount of rehabilitation and in view of the fact that their offer was for cash he considered that $750,000 was a good offer.
>
> Mr. J. J. MacLennan stated that only about 10 per cent of the Japanese properties were low land.

Those, Mr. Chairman, are statements from the three representatives of the Soldier Settlement of Canada.

On page 53, we have a letter written by Mr. Shears to Mr. Barnet dated October 30, 1943. It does not relate to the sale of the 769 parcels but perhaps it might be just as simple to put in the whole letter. I am concerned with one sentence in it.

> The committee assume that the appraisals—

I take it that that is the Custodian's committee.

> —the appraisals were made on the same basis as before and they were definitely of the opinion that such appraisals were very conservative as to value.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-83
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Now, Mr. Chairman, that leaves just two matters about which I should like to ask, with your approval.

The CHAIRMAN: The whole letter will go in, gentlemen. (The following is the full text of the letter.)

30 October, 1943.

I. T. BARNET, Esq.,
District Superintendent,
Soldier Settlement Board and Veterans' Land Act,
518 Rogers Building,
Vancouver, B.C.

Dear sir: Your letters of October 4 and your two letters of October 13 were duly received in which on behalf of the Director, The Veterans' Land Act you submitted an offert as follows:—

No. of Properties	Appraised Value	Offer
33	$ 39,329.00	$ 35,000.00
11	6,834.00	6,500.00
1	584.00	500.00
	$ 46,747.00	$ 42,000.00

These offers have been considered by the advisory committee under the chairmanship of Judge Whiteside.

The appraised value of the 769 parcels of land included in the recent deal with the Veterans' Land Act was $867,000, the purchase price being $850,000. The advisory committee pointed out that the difference was approximately 2 per cent.

As noted the above total appraised value of the properties now under consideration is $46,747 and your offer is $42,000, an approximate difference of 10 per cent.

The committee assume that the appraisals were made on the same basis as before and they were definitely of the opinion that such appraisals were very conservative as to value.

They feel unable to recommend to the Custodian that your offer be accepted but if you would revise it and agree to purchase all the properties on your list to which the Custodian is able to deliver title, at 2 per cent less than the appraised value, they would be prepared to favourably consider such an offer.

I would therefore be glad if you would advise whether or not the Director, The Veterans' Land Act would be interested in the purchase of these properties on the basis suggested and if so we will take the matter up further and recommend the acceptance of same to our department at Ottawa.

Yours truly,

(Signed) F. G. SHEARS,
Director.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. On page 41, Mr. Jaenicke asked Mr. Shears some questions about the minutes and the resolution approving the acceptance of the offer from the Soldier Settlement Board. I have a question or two on that. Mr. Shears, was this resolution preparad in advance of the meeting?—A. No, it was not prepared—at the conclusion of the meeting, a draft was made, with all the members present. Those are the points that they wanted emphasized and, later

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-84
www.nikkeimuseum.org

than that, I think the chairman, Judge Whiteside, incorporated the whole thing in his recommendation to the Honourable Secretary of State. It was not prepared, it was prepared from the meeting.

Q. Does it come down to this, then, the resolution which is quite a formal resolution, is it not?—A. Yes, and it was suggested it should be formal since this was the conclusion of the whole matter, and I think it states each member should have a copy of it.

Q. What I understand you to say is that this formal resolution was not prepared in advance of the meeting. There was a discussion at the meeting and the committee decided on the course it would take and the formal resolution was drafted?—A. Drafted, yes.

Q. Subsequently it incorporated in the minutes what was decided on there?—A. That is correct, the chairman and other members of the committee signed that particular part.

Q. The other question has to do with chattels which is one question on which you made some statements in earlier meetings before the committee as to the advisability of inventorying the chattels. There is an extract on page 10 of the minutes upon which I should like to invite your comment, Mr. Shears. This is from the minutes of the meeting of March 15:

> "Mr. Menzies stated that there was a very good market for second hand furniture at the present time and Mr. MacKenzie asked it there was a complete inventory of all chattels available. Mr. Wright explained that in view of the uncertainty as to whether or not the chattels were to be shipped, the Custodian had not considered it necessary or advisable to make a complete inventory of all farm chattels. Mr. Wright pointed out that in many cases chattels were stored in a particular room by the Japanese himself and they had not been disturbed and the Custodian did not feel he should accept the responsibility of inventorying them since this might prejudice his position in case the chattels were removed either by the tenant or some other persons over whom the Custodian had little control.
>
> Mr. Shears pointed out that considerable inventorying had been done and could be proceeded with if a policy of sale were adopted.

Now, I invite your comment on that statement, Mr. Shears. It has been indicated that there was some inventorying of farm chattels done. It was done, in the first instance, on a voluntary basis, but reading that minute one would almost infer that you had expressed the opinion that an inventory of chattels was practicable. Would you care to make a comment on that?—A. Was practicable?

Q. Yes.—A. I do not know whether I get your point regarding that. Complete inventories were not made in the first instance. One reason was that up until January 1943 there was no suggestion that there should be a liquidation of the chattels and therefore if the Japanese left his articles stored with a particular person an itemized inventory was not taken but what I did suggest I think, in my previous reference, and I wonder if you mind reading it again—

Q. You mean the whole reference?—A. No, just mine.

Q. "Mr. Shears pointed out considerable inventorying had been done and could be proceeded with if a policy of sale were adopted."—A. Yes.

Q. Now the previous paragraph contains information given by Mr. Wright which seems to suggest that a full inventory of the chattels would not be practicable and the custodian did not accept responsibility for any inventory and you are expressing the opinion that the inventory was practicable and it could be proceeded with if desired?—A. Yes, if liquidation became a policy. I think Mr. Wright was probably emphasizing the fact that in view of the

individuals status quo there was no particular need for an inventory up to that time but once we proceeded with the policy of liquidation we had to know what we were selling and inventories had to be taken.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Did that include trucks?

Mr. FLEMING: Are you asking me that?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: No, I am not.

Mr. FLEMING: There is no reference made to trucks, it speaks of farm chattels.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I would like the point cleared up.

The WITNESS: Cars and trucks had previously been taken over by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and had been disposed of.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: They were separate?

The WITNESS: They were separate from these chattels we are referring to now. In connection with matter of chattels and the taking of inventories it certainly is true that in many cases the Japanese left many quantities of chattels placed in the care of individuals and there again, up to that stage of proceedings, the custodian had not stepped in to take accurate inventories.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Mr. Chairman, I think there is this final point to be raised. We have had reference in the early testimony this morning by Mr. Shears to the effect that P.C. 469, dated January 19, 1943, in effect withdrew the freezing of this property for the Soldier Settlement of Canada which had been imposed by P.C. 5523, dated June 29, 1942.—A. Right.

Q. Now here is the custodian's committee meeting of March 15, 1943, two months after order in council number 4679 was made. In effect the freezing is lifted and yet we find this statement appearing in the minutes on page 8:

> The position of the Soldier Settlement of Canada was then outlined by Mr. McPherson and he stated that it was his understanding in the meetings held at Ottawa, at which the chairman attended, that it was definitely indicated that as a matter of policy it was the government's desire that the Soldier Settlement of Canada should have the first option to purchase any or all property if they so desired. The chairman stated that this was also his understanding of the situation. Mr. McPherson pointed out, however, that while the Soldier Settlement of Canada had a first option to purchase, it did not necessarily follow that they could purchase at their price, that any sales to the Soldier Settlement of Canada would be for a reasonable price and that the custodian was anxious that the committee should consider and approve of any such sales.
>
> Mr. MacKenzie requested information as to how the Soldier Settlement of Canada had come into the picture at all and Mr. McPherson explained that a special order in council was passed giving them authority to make a survey of the Japanese agricultural lands and that it further provided that they had the right to veto any dealings with such land.

Now why, two months after the repeal of P.C. 5523, is the committee still recorded as talking in terms of an imposition of a veto on lands when the veto has been removed? Why, in particular, do we have a statement that the present policy of the government, as of March, 1943, is that the Soldier Settlement of Canada should have the first option to purchase?—A. I think what Mr. McPherson was doing at that meeting was explaining to the committee just what had happened in the past. From the time of the order in council setting up the Soldier Settlement valuation, the Custodian was entirely removed from the picture. We were not able to lease property, nor rent property under that particular order in council. That had to be done by the Soldier Settlement. I think Mr. McPherson was pointing out to the committee that during the period under which order in council P.C. 5523 was in effect the Custodian was entirely withdrawn from the picture. On the introduction of P.C. 469 on January 9, 1943, the Custodian was back in the picture and Mr. McPherson came from Ottawa to say to the committee, "Now, at this time, the government is considering an offer which may be received from the Veterans' Land to purchase this land. It is the policy that this land should be sold."

Q. Perhaps we can shorten it up, Mr. Chairman, this way: Even having regard for P.C. 469 and the repeal of P.C. 5523, it was still government policy that this land should not be offered freely to the public, but that it should be sold to the Soldier Settlement of Canada?—A. I think that is true, but I would also say, so far as the Vancouver office was concerned, it was not government policy at that time that any property should be sold. It was not until July, 1943, that the general policy of liquidation became effective.

Q. We can go at least this far; it was government policy there should not be any sale to the public?—A. That is true.

Q. Of these farm lands?—A. Of these farm lands or any other lands.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, is it your pleasure that I now excuse Mr. Shears? We propose next Tuesday, with the approval of the steering committee, to have a representative here of the Japanese cooperative committee.

Mr. JAENICKE: Should not Mr. Shears stay here in order to answer any assertions that gentlemen might make?

The CHAIRMAN: I thought perhaps Dr. Coleman or other members of the department could answer those questions.

Dr. COLEMAN: I think Mr. Wright would be competent to do that. He was in the Vancouver office from 1942 to 1945.

The CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Shears can be excused.

The committee adjourned at 1.10 p.m. to meet again on Tuesday, May 27, 1947.

APPENDIX A

Order in Council revoking P.C. 5523, dated 29th June, 1942, and P.C. 6885, dated 20th July, 1942—transfer to the Custodian of the property of persons of the Japanese race evacuated from the protected areas of B.C.

P.C. 469

AT THE GOVERNMENT HOUSE AT OTTAWA

TUESDAY, the 19th day of January, 1943.

PRESENT:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL IN COUNCIL—

Whereas by Order in Council dated 29th June, 1942, (P.C. 5523) amended by Order in Council dated 4th August, 1942, (P.C. 6885) Regulations were made imposing certain duties and responsibilities on the Director of Soldier Settlement of Canada in relation to agricultural lands owned by persons of the Japanese race ordinarily resident in the protected areas of British Columbia;

And whereas the Secretary of State reports that the appraisals of lands contemplated by the said Order in Council as amended have been made and that it is the opinion of the Minister of Mines and Resources, to whom the Director of Soldier Settlement of Canada reports under the said Order in Council as amended, that the said Order in Council as amended, should be revoked;

That by Order in Council, dated 20th July, 1942, (P.C. 6247) it was provided that on and after the 1st August, 1942, all unfinished business of the Committee under the Chairmanship of the Honourable Mr. Justice Sidney A. Smith of Vancouver, appointed by Order in Council of 13th January, 1942, (P.C. 288) in respect of vessels or equipment vested in the Custodian under the

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-85
www.nikkeimuseum.org

said Order should be transferred to the Custodian, and the Custodian was vested with all vessels and equipment which had not been disposed of under the supervision of the said Committee;

That since the transfer was effected, question has been raised as to the authority of the Custodian to deal with unfinished business of the said Committee in relation to vessels or equipment disposed of prior to the 1st August, 1942, and it is expedient to remove any doubts in this respect;

That by Orders in Council relating to the property of persons of the Japanese race evacuated from the protected areas of British Columbia, the Custodian has been vested with the responsibility of controlling and managing property belonging to persons of the Japanese race who have been evacuated from the protected areas, except deposits of money, shares of stock, debentures, bonds or other securities or other property which the owner on being evacuated from the protected areas was able to take with him; and

That the evacuation of persons of the Japanese race from the protected areas has now been substantially completed and that it is necessary to provide facilities for liquidation of property in appropriate cases.

Therefore, His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Secretary of State, concurred in by the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Minister of Pensions and National Health, the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Fisheries, and under the authority of the War Measures Act, Chapter 206 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1927, is pleased to order and doth hereby order as follows:

1. Order in Council, dated 29th June, 1942, (P.C. 5523) and amending Order in Council dated 4th August, 1942, (P.C. 6885) are hereby revoked.

2. Paragraphs numbered 3 and 4 in Order in Council dated 20th July, 1942 (P.C. 6247) are hereby rescinded and the following are substituted therefor:

3. The Custodian may, where he considers it advisable so to do, liquidate, sell or otherwise dispose of any such vessel or equipment on such terms and conditions as he deems advisable; and any agreement entered into or document executed by the Custodian on or after August 1, 1942, and prior to the date of this Order, purporting to be an agreement for, or to be, a transfer, conveyance or other disposition of any such vessel or equipment or of any right, title or interest therein is hereby given full legal validity, force and effect as if the Custodian had full power to enter into such agreement or to execute such document, and as if such vessel or equipment or such right, title or interest therein, as the case may be, had been vested in the Custodian, at the time of the entry into such agreement or the execution of such document.

4. Without restricting the generality of the powers hereinbefore conferred, all unfinished business of the said Committee is hereby transferred to the Custodian and shall be deemed to have been so transferred as on and from the 1st August, 1942.

Wherever, under Orders in Council under the War Measures Act, Chapter 206 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1927, the Custodian has been vested with the power and responsibility of controlling and managing any property of persons of the Japanese race evacuated from the protected areas, such power and responsibility shall be deemed to include and to have included from the date of the vesting of such property in the Custodian, the power to liquidate, sell, or otherwise dispose of such property; and for the purpose of such liquidation, sale or other disposition the Consolidated Regulations Respecting Trading with the Enemy (1939) shall apply mutatis mutandis as if the property belonged to an enemy within the meaning of the said Consolidated Regulations.

Certified to be a true copy.

A. D. P. HEENEY,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-86
www.nikkeimuseum.org

SESSION 1947

HOUSE OF COMMONS

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 10

TUESDAY, MAY 27, 1947

WITNESSES:

Mrs. Hugh MacMillan, Secretary, and Mr. F. Andrew Brewin, Counsel, The Co-operative Committee on Japanese Canadians;

Mr. George Tanaka, Chairman, Japanese Canadian Committee for Democracy;

Dr. E. H. Coleman, C.M.G., K.C., Deputy Custodian of Enemy Property, and Mr. K. W. Wright, Counsel.

OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., B.A., L.Ph.,
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
1947

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, May 27, 1947.

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts met at 11.30 o'clock a.m., the Vice-Chairman, Mr. Gordon B. Isnor in the chair.

Members present: Messrs. Boucher, Burton, Denis, Fleming, Gladstone, Golding, Green, Homuth, Isnor, Jaenicke, Johnston, Marshall, Pinard, Probe, Smith (*Calgary West*), Thatcher, Warren.

In attendance: Dr. E. H. Coleman, C.M.G., Deputy Custodian of Enemy Property, and Mr. K. W. Wright, Counsel; Mrs. Hugh MacMillan, Secretary, and Mr. F. Andrew Brewin, Counsel, The Co-operative Committee on Japanese Canadians; Mr. George Tanaka, Chairman, Japanese Canadian Committee for Democracy.

Mr. Fleming moved,—

That an article published in *The Globe and Mail* of Wednesday, May 21, 1947, written by Mr. Warren Baldwin and entitled *Evidence B.C. Japs' Lands Resold at 816 P.C. of Purchase Prices* be printed as an appendix to this day's minutes of proceedings and evidence.

After discussion, and the question having been put on the said motion, it was resolved in the negative.

Mr. Fleming filed a copy of *The Globe and Mail* of May 21, 1947.

Mr. Brewin was called, heard and questioned.

Mrs. MacMillan and Mr. Tanaka were called and questioned.

Mr. Tanaka filed a copy of a questionnaire sent to Japanese evacuees, which is printed as *Appendix "A"* to this day's minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Mr. Tanaka produced eight files of completed questionnaires which were placed in the custody of the clerk of the Committee for examination by any member.

The witness retired.

At 1.20 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned to the call of the chair.

A. L. BURGESS,
Clerk of the Committee.

90026—1½

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-87
www.nikkeimuseum.org

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
May 27, 1947.

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts met this day at 11.30 a.m. The Vice-Chairman, Mr. Gordon B. Isnor, presided.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we have a quorum and we will now proceed to call the meeting to order.

Mr. FLEMING: Mr. Chairman, may I raise this matter. At our last meeting Mr. Murchison appeared and read a statement in which he complained in quite strong terms about an article which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* of Wednesday, May 21, reporting on the proceedings of this committee of the previous day. I do not know how many members of the committe had read that report before Mr. Murchison made his statement on it. For my part I had not read it. I am sorry I had not read it because while I think the committee wants to be abundantly fair to all witnesses and any witness who feels that he has not been fairly treated I am sure will receive a fair hearing by the members of this committee. I have, however, read the article over now and I do not find the ground for complaint to which Mr. Murchison has referred. Mr. Murchison's statement has been included in the record and I am suggesting to the committee that the entire statement that he complained of should be a matter of record. That is to say that I think the article itself should be printed in our proceedings. Now it is an article written by a senior member of the press gallery, a very experienced member, who I am sure enjoys the respect of the members of the House and of this committee. I am sure if more members had read the article before Mr. Murchison made his statement there would have been more comment on the tone and the nature of Mr. Murchison's statement. That is past now, but I do move, Mr. Chairman, that the article in question should be printed in the record of this committee.

Mr. WARREN: Mr. Chairman, may I ask what paper that is taken from?

Mr. FLEMING: It is the article that Mr. Murchison complained of.

Mr. WARREN: Yes, but I was not here and I do not know anything about it.

Mr. FLEMING: It is an article that appeared in the *Globe and Mail* on Wednesday May 21, and it is on page 8. Mr. Murchison made quite a lengthy statement about it and complained about it. For my part I do not know how many members had read that but I had not. I do say this; having read the article since Mr. Murchison made his statement, I cannot find in it the ground or the unfairness that he claimed to find in it. I think that while his statement is on the record the article of which he complains also should be on the record.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Are there any other comments?

Mr. HOMUTH: I second the motion.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion that the article appearing in the *Globe and Mail* of Wednesday, May 21, 1947, written by Mr. Warren Baldwin entitled "Evidence B.C. lands resold at 815 per cent of purchase price" be printed in the minutes of the proceedings of our committee.

Mr. JAENICKE: Mr. Chairman, I do not see why we should bring all these newspaper articles into our proceedings. Surely they have nothing to do with the matter we are investigating.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-88
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Mr. PINARD: I would like to know if the article refers directly to what happened in this committee?

Mr. FLEMING: It does.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: May I make this observation, gentlemen. I was one of those who had not read this article, prior to Mr. Murchison's laying the newspaper on the table, I glanced at it quickly and suggested to him that I did not see that any good purpose could be served by making an extended statement. More than that, if you will recall, I stood in my place as chairman and referred to the fact that he was making a statement, hoping that one of the members of the committee might object to the statement. There was no objection taken so he made the statement.

Mr. SMITH: I remember that very distinctly.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: If you had objected I would have given a ruling against a continued lengthy statement being made. I think Mr. Fleming in his statement has brought forth a thought which is in the minds of the majority of the members. Statements written by well-known writers in the press gallery, while perhaps giving information to the public, contain nothing from our standpoint and I should say there is no good purpose served by printing them in our proceedings.

Mr. FLEMING: May I just say a word about Mr. Jaenicke's point. If this matter were being reached now *de nova*, I do not think that anyone would think of bringing into the records a newspaper article. After all what guides this committee is what is brought in evidence before us. However, in view of the fact that Mr. Murchison was allowed to make a very lengthy and a very strong statement with respect to this article my point is that it would not be fair to leave this situation without putting the article on the record. I think anyone who has read the article since will find Mr. Murchison's statement lacking in justification. If it was a case of this statement being submitted over again I think there is much to be said for Mr. Jaenicke's point. If we were back to last Thursday and Mr. Murchison were undertaking to make his statement it would be different. However, Mr. Murchison has made a statement to the committee which does not do justice to the article so I suggest therefore, in fairness that this article ought to go on the record. I do not think the committee wants to take time at every meeting to receive complaints from witnesses about newspaper articles for we would then have to catch up with the newspaper articles ourselves and try to correct any unfair statement made by the witnesses.

Mr. SMITH: May I put it into much broader terms. It seems to me that in this form, in this committee, it is utterly improper for anyone to comment on any printed matter unless we have before us the printed matter on which he is commenting. I think as a lawyer Mr. Jaenicke will agree with that. Frankly I want to see an end of it and I think we might have done very well had we accepted the hint that the chairman handed to us at the last meeting. We did not do that because I for one did not want to do it. I thought that someone would say "Here is that fellow plugging the *Globe and Mail* again". Now, as the comment has been made on something that is not before us, it seems to me that we are in a very foolish position unless we have the article plus the comment.

Mr. JAENICKE: I do not know how the printing of this article will influence us in any manner, one way or another. The way I understand it is Mr. Murchison arose on a question of privilege the same way we rise in the House of Commons. He explained that he had been misinterpreted in this article. Now I know what Mr. Murchison said the day before or at the meeting before, and I do not see yet anything in the argument made by Mr. Fleming and Mr. Smith that we should clutter up our proceedings with this article. I cannot see it.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: It was just on a question of privilege with respect to Mr. Murchison, but what is your pleasure now?

Mr. HOMUTH: This public accounts committee has developed into a different sort of committee from anything I know as a public accounts committee. We have witnesses come here to be examined on certain matters of government policy and government administration. Before he is ever examined, an employee of the government is allowed to stand up in this room and give a long dissertation on his administration and naturally he does everything he possibly can to whitewash the government. Mr. Murchison's whole statement the other day was a direct whitewashing of everything with regard to the Japanese part of their policy. He did that, and it gets in the press and into this record and then we have to cross-examine him and the others on it. I think the time has come when witnesses should be brought here and interrogated by the committee on different matters but they should not be allowed to stand up and make statements such as Mr. Murchison made; and, furthermore, this is no place for Mr. Murchison, or any other employee of the government, or anyone else connected with this inquiry, to be allowed to come and rise on questions of privilege and take time trying to befog the committee in regard to articles which appear in the press.

Mr. GLADSTONE: Are you saying that he set out to be untruthful?

Mr. HOMUTH: I say that he set out to whitewash the government.

Mr. WARREN: I do not think that should go on the record.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: I think I should reply as chairman, Mr. Homuth. Any witness is privileged, I believe, if I read the rules correctly, to make a statement in reference to a matter of privilege. If I had to rule on that and that alone I would have to say to the witness "Yes, you are entitled to make a brief statement", and then I would use my own judgment.

Mr. HOMUTH: Then he would be questioned on the statement?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Yes. Now, gentlemen, you have heard the motion, are you ready for the question? You have heard the motion put forward by Mr. Fleming, seconded by Mr. Homuth.

(A standing vote resulted in a tie.)

I am obliged to vote as I expressed myself a few minutes ago that I thought it was unnecessary to print such articles and I therefore declare the motion lost.

Mr. FLEMING: Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen, if you are not going to print it in the proceedings may I ask that it be tabled by us so that it may appear among our records?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: That is quite all right.

I think that you have made a good statement Mr. Fleming and I think it covers the situation.

At the request of Mr. Fleming and Mr. Burton the matter of representation on behalf of the Japanese-Canadians was placed before us and it was decided to extend an invitation to their committee and I received—

Mr. FLEMING: If you will excuse me that is not quite right; it was not an invitation, that is what we decided.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Will you allow me to complete what I was saying?

Mr. FLEMING: I am sorry.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: As a result of a request contained in a letter from Mrs. Hugh MacMillan signed as secretary of the co-operative committee on

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-89
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Japanese-Canadians, after consultation with the steering committee I issued instructions that we invite one of them to represent the views of this committee. We have with us to-day three representatives including Mrs. Hugh MacMillan, the secretary, Mr. F. Andrew Brewin, counsel for the committee, and Mr. George Tanaka, chairman of the Japanese-Canadian Committee for Democracy. Who is to be your spokesman?

Mrs. MACMILLAN: Mr. Brewin.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Thank you, then I would like to call on Mr. Brewin.

F. Andrew Brewin, counsel for the Co-operative Committee on Japanese-Canadians, called:

By the Vice-Chairman:

Q. Mr. Brewin, no doubt you know that we have already held nine meetings of this committee since April 28, 1947, and we have had before the committee such witnesses as the Honourable Mr. Gibson, Doctor Coleman, Mr. H. W. Wright, Mr. D. H. W. Henry, Mr. Shears, and Mr. Gordon Murchison. You have read their evidence.

Now, gentlemen, is it your pleasure to hear Mr. Brewin.

Agreed.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Mr. Brewin, will you give us your name in full and the name of those for whom you are acting?

The WITNESS: My name in full is F. Andrew Brewin and I am acting as counsel for the co-operative committee on Japanese-Canadians. I think I should open by telling you what that committee is.

Mr. GLADSTONE: Where do you live?

The WITNESS: In Toronto.

The co-operative committee on Japanese-Canadians is a committee that was originally purely a voluntary committee. It was originally formed mostly of church groups, Y.M.C.A's and Y.W.C.A's., who were looking after the needs of the Japanese-Canadians who re-settled in eastern Caanda and other parts of Canada. Then, when the proposal for deportation came up the co-operative committee on Japanese-Canadians received support and help from about 70 per cent of the groups across Canada. A great many of the groups contributed money to fight the battle of the Japanese-Canadian in regard to deportation. I will not attempt to give you all the organizations which have lent their support to the co-operative committee but a partial list includes:—

The Church of England in Canada
The Catholic Archdiocese of Toronto
The Baptist Federation of Canada
The United Church of Canada
The Church of Christ (Disciples)
The Presbyterian Church of Canada
The Evangelical Lutheran Church
The Salvation Army
The Student Christian Movement
The Intervarsity Christian Fellowship
The Canadian Council of Churches
The Society of Friends
The Young Men's Christian Association
The Young Women's Christian Association
The United Nations Organization

The Canadian Welfare Council
The Canadian Association of Social Workers
The Canadian Association of Scientific Workers
The Canadian Jewish Congress
The National Council of Women
The Fellowship of Reconciliation
The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
The Civil Liberties Associations of Vancouver, Winnipeg, Toronto, Ottawa, Montreal
Canadian Congress of Labour
Trades and Labour Congress
Canadian Institute of International Affairs
Workers' Educational Association
Canadian Association for Adult Education
United Farmers Co-operative
Ukranian Association of Canada
Canadian Business and Professional Women
National Citizens Forum
Religion and Labour Foundation
Ontario Older Boys' Parliament
Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice
Holy Blossom Temple, Toronto
United Steel Workers of America
Canadian Seamen's Union
United Packing Houses of America
Canadian Legion
Leading newspapers in Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, London, Ottawa, Vancouver, etc.
Prominent individuals from all sections of society.

I mention these names merely to show that this committee, the co-operative committee on Japanese-Canadians, is broadly representative of those who have taken an interest in it. The problem of the Japanese-Canadians, from the point of view of the Japanese-Canadians, has been widely discussed and we have contacted a great many people. One of these committees, the Japanese-Canadian Committee for Democracy, in anticipation of a commission, has conducted what it calls an economic loss survey. It sent out forms some of which I have here.

Mr. BOUCHER: When you mentioned those names do you mean you speak for the head bodies of those organizations with respect to the churches and so on, or are they individual units?

The WITNESS: The national bodies sent support and contributed to the committee. People like Canon Judd of the Anglican Church, and Dr. Mutchmore of the United Church and there were a great many more of the local groups. As the committee knows there was very wide interest in this matter when the problem of deportation was before the people of Canada.

Mr. BOUCHER: You are, in effect, saying that you are representing at least the head bodies or the representatives of the churches and institutions you have named. You are not just representing members of those organizations?

The WITNESS: Oh, yes. I say they have taken part in and supported the work of this committee. I cannot say that everything we did has been taken up with them but they have given official support and sent their contributions to the committee. We have no formal membership but those various churches and national groups did take part in that way.

Mrs. MACMILLAN: Yes, and our committee is representative of the larger denominations of the churches "Y's" and labour unions.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-90
www.nikkeimuseum.org

The WITNESS: Yes, in other words, gentlemen, I think I can say we do represent pretty fully those who have taken an interest right across Canada.

By the Vice-Chairman:

Q. Mr. Brewin, I do not want to interrupt you, and I would favour you completing your statement and then we can clear up the points raised. There is, however, a name on your list, the Baptist Federation of Canada. Do you know the Baptist Federation of Canada?—A. No, I do not, myself.

Q. They do not represent the Baptists of Canada.—A. Mrs. MacMillan could tell me the extent to which they do.

Mr. BURTON: Previous witnesses have appeared before the committee and they were allowed to make their presentation and then the members of the committee were able to ask questions. I think it would be better, much better, to follow that procedure.

The WITNESS: We will be glad to try to clear that up.

Mr. JAENICKE: If this lady has better information as to the constitution, perhaps Mr. Brewin could stand aside.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Perhaps Mr. Brewin should make his statement.

The WITNESS: I do say we represent them in the sense that they have supported this organization. The Japanese Canadian committee for democracy which is one of the constituent groups which have worked with our committee conducted this economic loss survey. They sent out forms some of which I can refer to in detail, asking Japanese Canadians who might have had any property losses to fill in these detailed forms. The form has a number of headings which I can show you. At the present time they have received about 600 replies from all across Canada. The committee emphasized in the instructions that went with the reports, that they were anxious that there should be no exaggeration or puffing of these claims, and that they wanted a sober survey of what the situation was. As I say, we have some 600 replies. We cannot, of course, vouch for the accuracy of the statements as we have not had an opportunity of checking them but they are summaries, by and large of what the Japanese Canadian committee for democracy have asked for. I think I should add that after the Prime Minister, on the 24th of January, made his statement that some compensation would be made, and some machinery set up to provide for the loss of property arising out of the evacuation, that we had discussions with the Secretary of State who was good enough to spend some time with us on the matter. We put our representations before him and received every courtesy and co-operation and we are putting before this committee more or less the same information that we put before the Secretary of State. If I may, I will put our submission in first before I go into the evidence that we have. What we are asking this committee to recommend is that when the government sets up a commission, as I believe it proposes to do, that the terms of reference of the commission should be broad enough to cover all the property losses naturally and reasonably arising out of the evacuation. We have not endeavoured to put the losses of the Japanese Canadians on the basis of any impropriety on the part of the custodian or any other official of the government. What we say is by reason of the evacuation orders and of the fact that a great many of the Japanese Canadians were required to leave the coastal area as a matter of public policy, and without any fault of their own, the losses of property which can be weighed and which are fairly definite should be provided for. We are not asking for speculative claims but these definite losses should in fairness and justice be paid; and we would like to point out that that is a very much broader proposition than merely confining the issue to the action of the custodian, because it is our submission that no matter how carefully or how well the

custodian and his representatives act in seeking to protect property or how well they sought to make the result of the sales the inevitable result of the circumstances under which the sales were made and things that happened before the custodian stepped in; the deterioration of property, vandalism and various other things of that sort, makes it quite impossible for the custodian to have prevented losses arising through no fault of those who were required as a matter of government policy and without any disloyalty or fault of their own to leave their homes, their farms and their businesses.

Now, I think we can put the situation, it may seem a little indirect, Mr. Chairman, as briefly and as well as we can by telling the committee that if it does not have this information already of the parallel situation in the United States—because the Prime Minister has said in dealing with this matter that similar conditions arose in the United States and that Canadian policy must in general terms be a continental policy—while there would not be an exact following of the American procedure some similarity of policy was necessary; and that the situation which existed in Canada also existed in the States. I would like, with the permission of the committee, Mr. Chairman, to read a letter which was sent by the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. J. A. Krug, representing the government of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and a similar one to the Speaker of the Senate, inviting them to set up by act of their congress a claims commission with authority to investigate in broad general terms all things arising out of the evacuation order.

Mr. FLEMING: Pardon me, what is the date of that letter?

The WITNESS: April 24, 1946.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: What is your pleasure, gentlemen; shall the witness have permission to read the letter?

Carried.

The WITNESS:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

WASHINGTON

April 24, 1946.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER,—Enclosed is a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the adjudication of claims of persons of Japanese ancestry against the United States for losses arising out of the evacuation or exclusion of such persons by the War Department from the West Coast, Alaska, and Hawaii during World War II.

In 1942, the War Department, acting under executive order No. 9066, ordered the exclusion of all persons of Japanese ancestry from the Pacific coast of the continental United States, Alaska and a portion of Arizona. Most of them were removed to relocation centres administered by the War Relocation Authority. They were joined later by over 1,000 persons evacuated from Hawaii. For approximately two and one-half years, these American citizens and their alien parents, more than 100,000 in number, were exiled from their homes. After January 2, 1945, the majority of them were allowed to return to the evacuated areas and to pick up the ravelled ends of the life they knew before the forced evacuation. By the end of 1945, about half of these people had so returned.

Mr. Chairman, that situation is not parallel here; at first, the Japanese-Canadians did not return.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-91
www.nikkeimuseum.org

The remainder have been scattered throughout the country or, in the case of the thousands who are in the armed forces of the United States, are serving with the army of occupation in Europe or Asia. It is too early as yet to make a final estimate of actual financial and property losses sustained by the Japanese-Americans because of the evacuation, but it is well established that the losses have been heavy. Some lost everything they had; many lost most of what they had.

The chief military justification for the removal of these 110,000 persons was the possibility of the existence of a disloyal element in their midst, the critical military situation in the Pacific which increased uneasiness over the possibility of espionage or sabotage, and the lack of time and facilities for individual loyalty screening. The persons evacuated were not individually charged with any crime or with disloyalty, and subsequent experience has clearly demonstrated that the vast majority of them were and are good Americans. This is convincingly indicated by the outstanding record of our 23,000 Japanese-Americans who served in the armed forces in both the European and Pacific theatres, and by the fact that the records of the intelligence agencies show no case of sabotage or espionage by Americans of Japanese ancestry during the entire war.

Again, I might stop there and say that the experience in Canada, I believe, has been exactly the same. Our Japanese-Canadians have shown themselves to be loyal Canadians, and as far as I know there have been no cases of charges of sabotage against them.

Mr. GREEN: Of course, there are some internments.

The WITNESS: Yes, and I suppose the same thing happened in the United States. There was a small group which were affected at the very beginning of the war. I am talking now about the most of those in respect of which there was no internment.

The evacuation orders gave the persons affected desperately little time in which to settle their affairs. The governmental safeguards that were designed to prevent undue loss in these circumstances were somewhat tardily instituted, were not at once effectively publicized among the evacuees, and were never entirely successful.

I wonder if I might stop there to suggest to the committee that where people are scattered it is quite difficult effectively to publicize the steps that the government takes. Some of these people, I suppose, were not literate, could not read English and the net result was that in many cases they were made aware of the evacuation orders a week, or in some cases just a few hours before they were required to be evacuated; and that, despite every effort to acquaint them with the policy.

Merchants had to dispose of their stocks and businesses at sacrifice prices. In a setting of confusion and hysteria, many evacuees sold personal possessions for a small fraction of their value.

That is particularly what happened in the United States, it also happened here. We have quite a large number of cases where people sold out businesses or personal possessions because of that sort of thing and when they received the evacuation order they sold what they had for the best they could get; and it was very natural that they should do that. No fault, I think, attaches to them and certainly not to the government agency because that happened; and yet our submission is that was a loss that naturally arose out of the evacuation orders.

A large number had to accept totally inadequate arrangements for [illegible] and management of property.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-92
www.nikkeimuseum.org

The same thing happened here. People had to give up. They had to put someone in charge of their property, anybody they could find.

Mr. SMITH: May I suggest, Mr. Brewin, that when you cease quoting you say "end of quotation"; and then when you resume "quote"? In that way we will know what part of the material is being read and what is your own interpolation.

The WITNESS: Thank you very much, I will do that. I am quoting now:

Valuable leasehold interests had to be abandoned.

Continued exclusion increased the losses. Private buildings in which evacuees stored their property were broken into and vandalized.

This committee, I believe, already has some evidence of that sort, that is the sort of thing which is bound to happen under the circumstances which existed.

Mysterious fires destroyed vacant buildings. Property left with "friends" unaccountably disappeared; goods stored with the government sometimes were damaged or lost. Persons entrusted with the management of evacuee real property mulcted the owners in diverse ways. Tennants failed to pay rent, converted property to their own use, and committed waste.

That may have only happened to a small extent here, but under the circumstances it was inevitable that it should happen to some extent.

Prohibited from returning to the evacuated areas even temporarily to handle property matters, the evacuees were unable to protect themselves adequately. Property management assistance given by the War Relocation Authority on the west coast, although it often mitigated and sometimes prevented loss, could not completely solve the problem there, complicated as it was by difficulties in communication with absent owners and local prejudice. *

In our view a precisely similar situation faces the custodian, and certainly through no fault of the agencies concerned.

Mr. FLEMING: Mr. Brewin, have you a copy of that letter?

The WITNESS: I am sorry, I haven't:—

In relocation centres the only income opportunities for evacuees lay in centre employment at wage rates of $12 to $19 per month, plus small clothing allowances. Many felt compelled to discontinue payment of life insurance premiums. Some found themselves unable to make mortgage or tax payments and lost substantial equities.

All of the foregoing examples of tangible loss to the evacuees are directly attributable to the evacuation and continued exclusion of these persons from their homes. Unlike our fighting men and their families, who also made financial and personal sacrifices in this war, this group was given no statutory right to ameliorating benefits. These persons have had to bear the losses occasioned by the evacuation in addition to the war-time deprivations they have shared with the rest of the American people. For the first time in our history, persons of Japanese ancestry are appearing in substantial numbers on the relief rolls.

I don't believe that applies here at all.

The least that this country can do, in simple justice, is to afford some degree of compensation for the measurable special losses that the evacuees have suffered.

The only clear recourse which the evacuees now have, through the passage of private relief bills, is totally impracticable. The potential volume of evacuee claims, if added to the load under which the congressional claims committees are already labouring, might well produce a virtually unmanageable burden. The obvious result would be to postpone the settlement of most evacuee claims for an indefinitely protracted period. To provide for adjudication of the claims by the court of claims would be an imposition on that court, because of the small individual amounts involved and the potential volume of claims, and unfair to the claimants, because of the expense of prosecuting a claim before the court of claims and the probable delay in adjudication. The most economical and practical solution—one which congress has adopted on numerous occasions in the past for the handling of case claims arising out of a special subject-matter—is the creation of a special tribunal to hear and determine the claims.

The enclosed bill would establish an evacuation claims commission as such a tribunal. In order to avoid increasing the number of independent agencies and to benefit by the experience which this department has had with the entire evacuation and relocation problem, the bill would establish the commission within this department rather than as a separate federal agency.

The commission would have jurisdiction to adjudicate claims by persons of Japanese ancestry for damage to or loss of real of personal property, or other impairment of assets, that arose from or as a natural and reasonable consequence of the evacuation and exclusion program. This standard is sufficiently flexible to permit the commission to consider claims involving "property" losses only in the broad sense, such as the impairment of going-concern values. At the same time the standard excludes claims that are speculative and less definitely appraisable, such as claims for anticipated wages or profits that might have accrued had not the evacuation occurred, for deterioration of skills and earning capacity, and for physical hardships or mental suffering.

In determining the amount of relief to be granted, the commission would be required to consider other existing or intervening factors that affected the loss. Thus some losses, as in the case of businesses specializing in import of sale of Japanese goods, would have occurred even if there had been no evacuation. Likewise, damage may have been aggravated in some cases by failure of the evacuees to take steps which they reasonably should have taken, even in the abnormal circumstances, to protect themselves. On the other hand, there are numerous instances in which intervening factors immediately causing the loss, such as arson, theft, mortgage foreclosure, loss of goods while in government possession, or breach of trust, should not affect recovery, because the situation giving rise to the loss would not have occurred had the owners been permitted to remain in possession.

Among the types of claims excluded by the bill from consideration by the commission are claims of persons who were voluntarily or involuntarily deported to Japan after December 7, 1941, or who are resident in a foreign country. Several hundred evacuees voluntarily repatriated to Japan during the war. Since termination of hostilities approximately 7,500 persons, most of them evacuees, have at government expense voluntarily gone to Japan, chiefly from internment camps and the Tule Lake segregation centre. In addition, the Department of Justice has been determining who among the aliens (including persons who renounced their American citizenship) should be deported to Japan. This

processing is the culmination of the loyalty screening procedures to which the evacuees have been subjected since the evacuation. I do not believe that those repatriates and deportees have any moral claim upon this government. Similarly, I believe that persons who before the war went to Japan or elsewhere to establish residence have no claim for compensation that we need recognize.

The remaining provisions of the bill are largely self-explanatory and I shall merely mention the more important. All claims would have to be filed within 18 months following enactment, and the commission would be required to complete its work within three and one-half years thereafter. The commission would have broad investigatory authority, including the power of subpoena, and each claimant would be entitled to a hearing. Assistance in preparing claims for filing could be extended by the commission to needy claimants. The commission's adjudications would be conclusive and a bar to further recovery. Awards would be paid in the same manner as are final judgments of the court of claims, except that the commission would be authorized to pay small awards, not exceeding $2,500 in amount, in order to afford more expeditious relief to those whose need may be acute.

As a matter of fairness and good conscience, and because these particular American citizens and law-abiding aliens have borne with patience and undefeated loyalty the unique burdens which this government has thrown upon them, I strongly urge that the proposed legislation be enacted into law.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised me that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation to the congress.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. KRUG,
Secretary of the Interior.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

And now, may I say that in brief what we are asking this committee to recommend is a claims commission similar in general outline with similar general powers to be set up to investigate the situation in Canada which, roughly speaking, is a parallel. I may be allowed to point out now the difference in the United States where the Japanese-Americans were allowed to go back after January 5, 1945. You had a different situation in Canada.

Mr. FLEMING: Are you going to tell us anything about the action which has been taken by the two houses of congress pursuant to Mr. Krug's request?

The WITNESS: Yes. That is a matter on which I am not completely up-to-date. When the matter first came before it, it was reported favourably on by the judiciary committees of both the Senate and the House of Representatives. I believe it was approved by the Senate but it was not approved by the House of Representatives. It came up at the fag-end of the session. I am not sure whether there was any discussion on it in the House of Representatives or not, but in any event I am informed that it did not pass that house and that it could only have passed had unanimous approval been forthcoming and that was not the case, so the bill was put over until the present session of congress. When I had an opportunity of seeing the Secretary of State at the beginning of this year—I think that was in March last—I raised this matter and he suggested that he had some information to the effect that the United States government and congress had not proceeded with the legislation. I wrote down to the

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-93
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Secretary of the Interior and some others who were familiar with the situation in the congress and I have received replies from them that the government was then going to present the bill in congress again with the full approval of the congress, and I have now received word back, with a copy of a letter from the President himself sending the bill to congress and asking that congress pass it. The only copy I have of that I sent to the Prime Minister in a letter to him and I am sorry that I haven't a copy of it here. I don't know, perhaps somebody else knows, whether these bills finally have gone through yet; but all that I can say is that they were presented to this session of congress with the approval of the government and require the approval of the judiciary committees of both houses, and those who wrote to me said that there would be little doubt that the bills would go through. To the best of my information the bills have not gone through yet, and that is the most up-to-date information that I can give this committee.

Now, I want to deal with the economic-loss survey of our neighbour a moment, to try to show you that the losses were substantial. We have not made a summary of the 600 claims that have come in, because they have been coming in almost from day to day, but a survey was made on the 27th of January—I mean a summary was made on the 27th of January of the 200 claims that had come in up to that date. Now, I want again to say that we cannot, of course, vouch for the accuracy of these claims. Many of those who left their homes may perhaps, for obvious reasons, have put a higher value—naturally the optimism of a business man about a business he can't carry on may be reflected in these figures. Nevertheless, they serve to show the nature of the claims, and we made every effort to ask them to be modest and conservative in their estimates.

Mr. FLEMING: Oh, you asked them to be conservative?

The WITNESS: I mean, with respect to the amount that they claimed.

Mr. PINARD: Can you tell the committee how the forms were obtained?

The WITNESS: They were sent out through the mail to them.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: You might file one, Mr. Brewin.

The WITNESS: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, but I haven't one of the forms here. I was going to take some at random just to show you the nature of the claim.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Would you file a copy of your questionnaire?

The WITNESS: Mr. Tanaka has a duplicate copy of his own and will be glad to make that available to the committee if it wishes to have it for its records.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Yes, you referred to it earlier.

The WITNESS: This is the form to which I referred:—

Form No. 1

ECONOMIC LOSS SURVEY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA EVACUEES

JAPANESE CANADIAN COMMITTEE FOR DEMOCRACY

84 Gerrard Street East, Toronto 2, Ont.

All information supplied will be treated as confidential and used only for the purposes of presenting claims for restitution.

1. Name ..... Age ..... Citizenship .....
2. Pre-evacuation address .....
3. Present address .....
4. Pre-evacuation occupation .....
5. Present occupation .....

6. *Real estate (residential):*

Street address .....
Legal description (Block No....., Lot No.....).....
Year of purchase ..... Purchase price of property ..... $.....
Estimated value of improvements to property ..... $.....
Estimated market value of property at time of evacuation ..... $.....
Assessed value at time of evacuation ..... $.....
Estimated present day market value of property ..... $.....
Price sold by custodian ..... $.....
What payment, if any, have you received from the custodian ..... $.....
Was this property sold with your consent? Yes ..... No .....
Are you satisfied with custodian's sale price? Yes ..... No .....

7. *Business:*

Name of firm ..... Type of business .....
Street address .....
Partnership; limited company; or sole proprietor .....
If either of the former, give details .....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
..... $.....
..... $.....
..... $.....
If owner of premises, state value at time of evacuation ..... $.....
Price of premises sold by custodian ..... $.....
What payment, if any, have you received from the custodian ..... $.....
Estimated value of business at time of evacuation:

(a) Fixtures and equipment	$.....	
(b) Inventories of stock	$.....	
(c) Goodwill	$.....	
Total	$.....	$.....

8. *Farm property:*

Location .....
Legal description .....
Type of farm ..... Acreage .....
Year of purchase ..... Purchase price of farm property. $.....
Estimated value of improvements ..... $.....
Assessed value at time of evacuation ..... $.....
Estimated market value of farm at time of evacuation:

(a) Land and buildings	$.....	
(b) Equipment and supplies	$.....	
(c) Livestock	$.....	
(d) Crops	$.....	
Total	$.....	$.....

Price sold by custodian ..... $.....
What payment, if any, have you received from the custodian? ..... $.....
Estimated present day market value of property ..... $.....
Was this property sold with your consent? .....
Are you satisfied with the custodian's selling price? Yes..... No.....

9. *Fishing vessels and gear:*

Type of boat .....
Length ..... Beam .....
Engine: Make ..... Horsepower .....

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-94
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Estimated market value at time of evacuation ..... $.....
Price sold by committee or custodian ..... $.....
What payment, if any, have you received from the custodian ..... $.....
Estimated present day market value ..... $.....
Deductions connected with above sales ..... $.....
Net amount received ..... $.....

9a. *Fishing gear:*
Estimated market value at time of evacuation ..... $.....
Custodian's selling price ..... $.....
What payment, if any, have you received from the custodian? ..... $.....

10. *Personal estate:*
Estimated market value at time of evacuation:
(a) Automobiles, trucks, etc. ..... $.....
Custodian's selling price ..... $.....
(b) Furniture, fixtures, radios, cameras, etc. ..... $.....
Custodian's selling price ..... $.....
(c) Miscellaneous ..... $.....
Custodian's selling price ..... $.....

11. *Loss of revenue* (rent, income, wages, etc):
1942 $..... 1943 $..... 1944 $..... 1945 $..... 1946 $.....

12. *Accounts uncollected* (Rent, interest, loan, deposit, claims, etc.):
..... $.....
..... $.....

13. *Fees paid* (attorney or agent, storage, transportation, travelling, medical, education, funeral or any other service fees which can be directly attributed to evacuation):
..... $.....
..... $.....

14. *Personal loss due to:* Cancellation, abandonment of insurance policies, contracts, etc. ..... $.....
..... $.....

15. *Family allowances and relief deductions:*
Had family allowances not been denied while in British Columbia, what total payments would have been received since .....
..... $.....
Were relief payments deducted from your custodian account? .....
If so, state amount ..... $.....

16. *Comments:*
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
To the best of my knowledge, the foregoing facts are true.

Date..... Signed....."

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Is that form sworn to?
The WITNESS: No, we did not ask that.

By Mr. Pinard:

Q. Who prepared these forms?—A. The Japanese-Canadian Committee for Democracy.

Q. Who are the members?—A. Mr. Tanaka here is chairman. Most of the members are in Toronto although they have started affiliated groups and contacts in camps throughout the whole of Canada; but the actual executive and the important part of the work is done by a committee on behalf of the Japanese and they are largely resident in Toronto and district.

Q. Were these forms sent to those who interned?—A. I do not know that.

Mr. TANAKA: Mostly to people here.

By Mr. Pinard:

Q. How many forms did you send out?—A. We sent out altogether 4,000 forms across the country.

Q. How many replies?—A. Six hundred. There are some areas where they have not replied yet but will reply.

Q. When were they sent out?—A. In December of last year right through to the present time. We sent them out first to Ontario and then extended it to other fields as we got committees in local areas to sit.

Q. A moment ago you were talking about 200 claims?—A. I was coming back to that and I want to say that I have a summary of the first 200 that we got in largely, I believe, from Ontario, the Toronto area. At that time it was London to Toronto. And according to the total estimated value of their real estate, business, farms, fishing equipment, and so on, the amount would total $1,400,000. That is their estimate. It may be a little high; but it is what they think their various farms, properties and so on were worth. Then as to the amount that they received either in the way of forced sale or the custodian's sale price—they included both—what they received was $351,000; so the total loss would be just over $1,000,000. Now, that was the summary of the first 200 claims that came in. On investigation, no doubt, many of these claims may appear to include amounts that they cannot possibly establish, but we have a collection of these claims and I thought the committee might be interested to have one or two samples. There was one individual case of a person in Toronto that Mr. Tanaka brought to my attention. He secured the information; I did not. It was the case of Mr. and Mrs. Cato, living in Toronto. In September 1939 they purchased a 1928 model Oldsmobile sedan for $175. After purchase they overhauled the engine and installed a set of four tires. The owners were notified by the custodian on January 21, 1943, re file letter 12980, that the car had been sold for the amount of $15 and that administrative expenses totalled $15. So they received nothing for the car. I am not suggesting it is necessarily a typical of the other cases where the actual result of the sale was negligible. It may have been that by the time the custodian got hold of the car it was only worth $15 but we do not know about that. We do know that it was a sedan for which they paid $175 and they installed a new set of tires and the net result was that they got nothing for it.

By Mr. Pinard:

Q. When was it purchased?—A. It was purchased in September 1939.

Q. At a price of $175 at that time?—A. Yes, and they also overhauled the engine and installed a set of four tires. I am not trying to give any of these cases as shocking examples but rather as the sort of thing which has happened and which we submit requires investigation. Many of these claims are quite small. Now just a few minutes before I came into the room we ran through and picked out a few cases more or less at random from these forms and this is the sort of thing which is in them. Here is the case of a man named Robert Hoita, age 55, a Canadian veteran of the 1914-1918 war. He lived in Victoria. He is retired now because of his 1914-1918 war wounds and he was a gardener before. He says he purchased a piece of property on Francis avenue, Victoria, for

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-95
www.nikkeimuseum.org

$1,200 and that he added $500 improvements. Then he estimates the market value at $2,000. The city of Victoria assessed the property at $1,700 and Hoita estimates the present market value at approximately $2,500. The sale price according to his information was $1,150 and he says it was not sold with his consent and he wants to know—some of them make comments on these forms here—why the custodian sold a residence of a 1914-1918 veterans.

Mr. WARREN: Did you say it was sold with his consent?

The WITNESS: No, it was sold without his consent. Then he says the furniture and fixtures were worth $500 and were sold for $160. He signs the form. There again we just picked this out. Some of these forms show substantial losses but on the other hand some of them show practically no loss. Here is one *re* Nahamura, age 45, a Japanese national, living in Vancouver. He is now living in *Gormley*. He was a landscape gardener and he says he purchased property in Vancouver for $1,100 and he estimates the improvements at $600 at the time of evacuation, and he said it was worth $1,600. The assessed value was $1,600. He estimates the present value at $2,500 but the price it was sold for by the custodian was $1,050 and he received $600. In some cases there were deductions on account of relief payments to the family which would account for the difference, and we would suggest that the commission have power to look into these things. They were proper deductions at the time but I question whether those who had to leave their occupations and accept forced relief should have that money deducted from the sale price of the properties. Then Mr. Nahamura added some information. He says he had a Chevrolet pick-up delivery truck that he estimates was worth $600 which was sold for $400. Then he says he had furniture and fixtures, radio, etc. and he estimates their value at $1,000 and said that the custodian's selling price must have been around $100 because that was the amount of an unknown credit to his account. He deals with other expenses that he had and he summarizes his list. We have here also the case of Paul Suzuki. He was the sole proprietor of a cleaning and dressmaking business in Vancouver which he valued at $2,069.45.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: How was it made up?

The WITNESS: Furniture, fixtures and equipment, $569.45; good will, $1,500.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Good will.

The WITNESS: It may be high, one does not know. Then he includes a Pontiac coach which he values at $1,563 and he said he made a forced individual sale at $505. Then he adds this comment "I am a Canadian by naturalization. The evacuation was based on reasons other than military security. The government of Canada should bear responsibility for the restitution of the above losses".

Perhaps the reason for expressing that view is because he also says "two of my Canadian born sons have served in His Majesty's forces and true loyalty cannot be overlooked in considering the above losses."

Then there are a good many business claims. Here is a man, Mr. Nasu, a Canadian, at Uclet. He says that he purchased property in 1940 for $2,000. He estimates that he added $2,000 in improvements and he estimates the market value at $2,500. The assessed value was $1,750 and he estimates the present market value of the property at $3,750. The price sold by the custodian was $720.85. Then he also has some details about fishing gear and furniture and fixtures.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how much detail the committee wants. I could go on picking out cases at random.

Mr. SMITH: You have given us enough.

The WITNESS: The cases would show at least bona fide claims. In many claims, the amounts compare with the assessed value of the property and it is

surely improbable that the assessment was at a great over-valuation and the amounts recovered in many instances were less than the assessed value. Some of these cases were businesses that had to be disposed of in a hurry. Some were very substantial businesses. We have a lot of fishing boat claims and we have done our best to collect this material as thoroughly as possible. There are no doubt some exaggerations and there may be some explanation for these things which is not revealed to us in the forms, but we feel in these 600 cases, quite apart from the individual cases themselves, the overall survey shows that there is something substantial to be investigated. It also shows that many of these losses were sustained from what might be called forced liquidation before the custodian entered the property. In some cases there was disappearance of property. In some cases they said that actually in the more remote parts they had to leave within twenty-four hours of the time they received the notice and that in the excitement of the moment they would dispose of their property in the neighbourhood as quickly as they could. All of these things have satisfied our committee that a broad commission with wide powers of reference, not restricted to the enquiry of cases where the custodian sold at too low a price might be able to make proper assessment of the loss. The property may have actually been sold at the best price possible but, after all, if a large group in the community is required to leave in something of a hurry, values in that neighbourhood are going to go down very substantially apart from anything else at all. We request that this committee recommend to the government, it may be that it is your intention already, that a commission with powers at least as broad as the terms of reference in the bill before the United States Congress should be set up. In years to come there would be no feeling that we, as Canadians, and Canada as a country have not behaved properly to these people who are our fellow-citizens and who themselves, with the exception of a few at the beginning, have a clear record. We are very much convinced that is what the people in Canada would like to see done. The thing we are anxious about is that the terms of reference are not confined to a narrow scope so that a judge or commissioner sitting to determine the matters will not feel inhibited by the terms of reference when inquiring into the other aspects of the matter.

By Mr. Green:

Q. Have you worked out any terms of reference?—A. Yes, we have a suggestion to make to the government which follows very closely the American bill.

Q. Could you give the wording of your suggested reference?—A. We have suggested:—

1. There shall be constituted a commission under the general supervision of the secretary of state to be known as the "Evacuation Claims Commission". The commission shall consist of a chairman, who shall be a person who holds or has held high judicial office, two other members to be appointed by the secretary of state (or the Governor in Council).

Actually that is a matter for the government to concern themselves with as to which department or who shall appoint the members of the commission.

2. The commission shall have jurisdiction to investigate and decide upon any claim by a person of the Japanese race, arising on or after December 7, 1941, when and to the extent that such claim has not been compensated for by insurance or otherwise, and is substantiated in such manner as the commission may prescribe for damage to or loss or destruction to the real or personal property including without limitation damage to or loss or destruction of personal property vested in the custodian, or other impairment of assets that fairly arise out of or is a reasonable or

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-96
www.nikkeimuseum.org

natural consequence of the evacuation of such person from the protected area in British Columbia by reason of the order of the minister of Justice under regulation 4 in the Defence of Canada Regulations or under P.C. 1665 of March 4, 1942, or any other law or order requiring the evacuation of the said area by persons of the Japanese race.

As used herein "evacuation" shall include voluntary departure from the protected area prior to but in anticipation of the making of any order under the regulations or orders in council above referred to.

The commission shall have power to consider in determining the amount of relief that would be fair and equitable according to the facts as they appear in each case, the existence or intervention of other causes effecting the damage or loss including action or non-action by the claimant or his representatives, and the action of the custodian of alien enemy property or his agents, and any monies paid over or held by the said custodian and deductions therefrom by way of commission or expenses or otherwise.

3. (a) The commission shall receive claims for a period of twelve months from the date of this order. All claims not presented within that time shall be forever barred.

(b) The commission shall not consider any claim

(1) For damage or loss arising out of the internment under the Defence of Canada Regulations of any person.

(2) For damage or loss on account of death or personal injury, personal inconvenience, physical hardship or mental suffering.

(3) For damage or loss to any property vested in the custodian by virtue of the trading with the enemy regulations.

4. The commission shall give reasonable notice to the interested parties, of an opportunity for them to be heard and present evidence before making the final determination of any claim, and shall be entitled to take evidence by way of affidavit or otherwise in its discretion.

It shall have for the purpose of any hearing or investigation authorized by this order, all the powers conferred under the Public Inquiries Act.

5. The commission shall dispose of all claims filed with it upon written findings of fact and reasons for the decision, and a copy of such claim shall be mailed to the claimant or his solicitor and shall be filed with the Secretary of State.

The amount of such claim, together with an allowance not to exceed 10 per cent of such claim for costs to solicitor or counsel representing the claimant, together with all expenses or costs incurred by the commission in connection with this order, shall be paid out of moneys, etc.

6. For the purpose of this order the commission may appoint the clerk and such solicitors, examiners, interpreters, appraisers and other employees as may be necessary to conduct the business of the commission and may call upon all departments and agencies of the government of Canada to assist the commission in the carrying out of the duties imposed by this order.

By Mr. Green:

Q. Do you include in that those Japanese who were evacuated from the coast, repatriated to Japan, about 4,000 of them?—A. I do not know that we either include or exclude them, expressly. I do not think there is any language that covers them.

Q. Your reference covers them all?—A. I suppose it does; any claim by any person of the Japanese race. There would be, I imagine, a considerable

difficulty over people repatriated to Japan, over their being able to present their claims. This is just the rough draft. No doubt the government have adequate draftsmen. This is an outline of what we thought from our point of view would be a medium which would establish fairness and justice to the Japanese-Canadians.

By Mr. Pinard:

Q. Do you think this should be included? Do you think they should be included?—A. There were several classes repatriated, some who were repatriated because they were disloyal to Canada—

Mr. GREEN: They were all repatriated.

The WITNESS: Some were repatriated because they were members of a family of old people and they had to go, but out of respect for their parents, or something like that. If they come back, if they are allowed to come back—it is a matter of government policy. When they are here, and they are Canadian citizens, we do not see any reason why they should not make a claim like anybody else. It all depends on the particular reasons for which they went. The government will decide its own policy with regard to it.

By Mr. Green:

Q. No, no; but everyone over sixteen years of age who requested repatriation was sent not because they were disloyal or for any reason of that kind, but because they asked to be sent over. I would like to know whether your committee believe that they should all be subject to the same rights of compensation as the Japanese who remained in Canada?—A. I do not think anyone who was deported for disloyalty should be.

Q. They were all deported at their own request.—A. I think it is a matter which should be considered on the basis of individual circumstances. If, as I say—and I am only extemporizing this, I have not obtained the view of the members of our committee—but as I say it is my information that quite a few of those who went away were the sons of aged parents and they all asked to go to Japan because it was a filial duty, because there would be no one to look after their parents over in Japan. They went voluntarily, they signed these forms and went. Many of them are still Canadian citizens. Certainly, I would not be one to say that they had not the right. However, perhaps that is a matter of detail. I don't suppose that this commission would purport to go over to Japan and hear claims from people living there. Our primary concern is with those who remained in Canada as Canadian citizens and who, we think, should have fair treatment such as we would like to accord to any other Canadian citizen.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. I see here you have a one-year period of limitation within which claims can be filed.—A. Yes, we suggested that because we thought there should be some period of limitation, but we also urged that that limitation of one year operate only from the time when the commission is set up.

Q. That is one thing on which we wanted to be clear, the one-year limitation you proposed would operate from the date of the establishment of the commission?—A. That is right; I mean, there has to be some period. The commission can't go on for ever and ever. And we think that any Japanese-Canadian would have ample time within the period of one year in which to file at least some sort of a claim and get their names before the commission.

Mr. GREEN: Just one other question.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Are you through with your presentation?

The WITNESS: Yes.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-97
www.nikkeimuseum.org

By Mr. Green:

Q. You spoke of Japanese being evacuated on twenty-four hours' notice. Have you many cases of that kind which have come to your attention? I am very much surprised to hear that. —A. Again, Mr. Tanaka has the details more fully than I do. We had under the Forbes commission some cases, I would not say very extensive, of people on the coast in remote areas who did not receive word; and we may have some cases—there were notices that aliens would require to be evacuated and many Japanese-Canadians who were citizens thought they were not going to be avacuated. Then there were some notices given, I think, by radio. Some heard them and some did not; and some naturally took the attitude that being Canadian citizens it did not apply to them. Then, of course, there were some who could not even read, who did not hear about it until the last moment. I think the actual order for evacuation was made on the 4th of March.

Q. It took some months to carry out the evacuations. I know that it was done in certain areas at certain times. I would be very much surprised if there were many cases where there was not longer notice than twenty-four hours.—A. I do not suppose that there were many like that, but we have had other cases where there was a week's notice and cases where there was a notice of two weeks. You see, the process took place over a period of time. Yes, I see that I was right, the general order applying to all of Japanese ancestry was dated the 4th of March and I believe it would be on the 28th of March that public notice was given that they were required to evacuate—it would have been given a few days before that possibly, that Japanese nationals were required to remove from the lower mainland, were required to report on the 27th of March; naturalized were required to report on the 30th of March, and Canadian-born were required to report on the 31st of March. At that time they were generally given approximately twenty-four or seventy-two hours' notice to be ready for evacuation from restricted areas.

Q. That was to report, that was not to be evacuated?—A. Yes; but in many cases they had to come from some distances with all their things and I do not think they got back again to their homes.

Q. Oh, yes.—A. Mr. Tanaka, who was there, said there were some who did not have an opportunity to get back.

Mr. TANAKA: In some cases they only had a half-hour's notice.

Mr. FLEMING: Would you mind speaking a little louder, please.

The WITNESS: In some cases, he said, they only got a half-hour's notice. Of course, it would be a difficult thing to serve notices on a lot of these people.

Mr. PINARD: Don't you think they were expecting it?

The WITNESS: No, many of them did not.

Mr. LAPOINTE: They knew we were at war. Didn't they know about Pearl Harbour?

The WITNESS: They knew about Pearl Harbor. The first announcement of government policy was that Japanese aliens would be required to move from security areas. I submit that an announcement of policy like that would make some of them feel that they could continue to stay there because they were Canadian citizens. Perhaps some of them did not understand the implications of war. After all, lots of simple people do not understand what is going to happen when war circumstances arise.

By Mr. Green:

Q. The fishing boats were called in.—A. They were called in in January.

Q. They were called in in December. I heard the radio announcement myself, the 7th or 8th of December.—A. The order was made on the 15th of January. They were immobilized I understand at the outbreak of war, immediately after Pearl Harbor, but I think the actual taking over was done in January. But even allowing the widest latitude there are bound to be quite a few who did not get satisfactory notice, who do not listen to radios. There are even people who do not read the newspapers; and until they got a positive notice that they themselves were required to go they may have been hoping and expecting that it did not apply to them. In any event there are bound to be under those circumstances, it seems to me, hysteria, confusion and excitement; they perhaps did what they would not otherwise have done. I think there is plenty of evidence of that.

By the Vice-Chairman:

Q. Mr. Brewin, would you tell us whether or not the United States took action along similar lines regarding sending out notices?—A. I am afraid that I haven't got that information.

Q. Do you know if they took any action?—A. I cannot say that. We had all this extra machinery and the sending out of the notices was tardy. What was done in their case, I do not know.

Q. Do you know whether they appointed a custodian along the same lines?—A. Very similar. Apparently they appointed a War Relocation Authority given roughly the same authority as our custodian.

Q. When?—A. I could not give you the date. You will know the custodian was appointed in Canada and given responsibility at an early date, I take it that the custodian—I suppose he has already given evidence—I take it that it was some time before he could take over the physical protection of the assets committed to his care; and it was during that period Mr. Tanaka told me that for a time he left, at the time he was evacuated, there were many properties which the custodian or his representative had not yet had time to do anything with. That had nothing to do with the actual date of the evacuation. The custodian may have moved as quickly as he could to deal with the properties which came under his protection, but the mere passing of the order does not protect the property; and some of these people, at any rate, were moved out before the custodian moved in. I believe you have taken evidence from his representatives as to that.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: They were moved out before he had a chance to take over.

The WITNESS: They moved out at the order of the government; naturally they had to move out because of the government order.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: And they left their property in the charge of friends.

The WITNESS: Yes.

By Mr. Smith:

Q. May I ask one question: having regard to the 200 claims to which you have referred, I understand they run to a total of around $700,000 to $800,000?—A. Around $1,000,000.

Q. Don't you think that might be an average?—A. I think it might be a little higher than the average; for this reason, that people submitting claims might have put a little higher value on them than was really justified, notwithstanding the fact that we asked them to keep the claims, as I said, conservative; and, too, many included items which properly should not be there.

Q. If you compare the 200 with the 4,000 it just takes a little simple arithmetic to arrive at the answer; it is going to take something like $20,000,000 to $30,000,000 to settle these claims.—A. No, with great respect; that, in my view, is very unlikely. Out of the 4,000 that we sent out we have, so far,

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-96
www.nikkeimuseum.org

received only about 600 replies. We sent the forms out to everybody of whom we had knowledge because we wanted to make it as fair and complete as possible. Quite a few of those to whom we sent these forms have claims and there are quite a number of others who have not. As a matter of fact, we would be very much surprised if there were more than a thousand claims in all, from the information we have. That would mean, on the basis of the 200 claims of which we have made a summary, that out of the total of 1,000 claims which we expect you would have, on the basis of a rough average, a total amount of $5,000,000; and, as I said before, no doubt some of these claims would in the final analysis not amount to any substantial figure. In my estimation, that would be a rather high figure to put on it. We are not for a moment thinking in terms of $20,000,000 or $30,000,000.

Q. Then you do not think the 200 claims which you have summarized would be a fair average for the 4,000?—A. Certainly not. Of the 4,000 we sent out we have received so far only about 600. Then, as I say, we do not expect altogether that there will be more than about a thousand to file claims. We do not expect everyone to whom we sent the 4,000 questionnaires will have a claim to file, by any means. As a matter of fact, if one thousand out of the 4,000 makes a claim we think that would be a very high average.

Q. On what do you base that statement?—A. On our experience to date. For instance, 200 claims came in out of 650, that was in an area in the Toronto district where the better-to-do tended to settle. Included in those to whom the questionnaires were sent were a lot of younger people who would have no property, so I think that would be a high average. We anticipate that there will be about 1,000 claims, although there may be more.

Q. I want to ask you about one other matter, and that is all. These claims are being instituted against the dominion government. Let us take a family which I know very well who were evacuated from a point in British Columbia and settled in Alberta. They are at the present time to my own personal knowledge definitely better off farming than they would have been had they stayed on their own small piece of land in British Columbia. Do you not think that in a case of that kind that is something which should be taken into account; in other words, they benefited by the evacuation; should not that be taken into account?—A. We have suggested that the commission be given the power to take into account the widest variety of things under all circumstances with respect to those who were evacuated; in other words, to define what is fair and reasonable in regard to each. When you are talking about property claims; if I have a loss on a car and have got perhaps only a fraction of its value, the mere fact that years later I may have got some benefit from the change does not make me feel that I should not get the value of the car.

Q. You are a lawyer, and so am I; if I do something to you which in effect increases your assets, that is taking into account in all circumstances, isn't it?—A. I quite agree, that anything tangible that increases assets should be considered and we have projected that in our draft; but I do not agree that intangible things such as the fact that you may be doing a little bit better now than you were before should be taken into account. On the same parity of reasoning we would be able to present large claims for those who left prosperous businesses and skilled occupations but who are perhaps working on sugar farms in Alberta as common labourers. We are not asking to include those claims because we regard them as ineligible in that they are not tangible enough to make a basis for a reasonable claim. Now, by parity reasoning we do not take the whole thing intangibly. They did have the evacuation policy and there were many forced sales and so on, and that is the reason we have suggested the broad terms of reference so that the cases could be studied. We certainly do not think that a lot of intangible benefits should be included.

Q. All right, but you have in one of your claims so much for the good-will of the business. Obviously that claim is based on the worth of the business at that time including an intangible thing called good-will. Surely that ends there. Now assuming that person, and I am not disputing this for a moment so please do not misunderstand me, but supposing that person was compelled to move from the coastal area with his family. He would have been undoubtedly better off if he had not done that. Do you not think there should be some consideration, or let us use whatever other word you like, given to him?—A. I think the commission should hear evidence all about that and try to decide what is fair.

Q. That is all I wanted to know?—A. Yes, there are many things on both sides that have to be taken into accounts.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: I want to ask Mr. Brewin if he will be good enough, as have been previous witnesses, to table one complete folder?

The WITNESS: Yes, but I wonder if I might have it back. These are the only copies we have got and if we can get them back from the committee it would be fine.

Mr. MARSHALL: How many cases are there in the one folder?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: There are twenty-four, they cover numbers 136 to 160.

The WITNESS: There may be a few fishing claims and something of that sort.

Mr. MARSHALL: I think we should have samples of the various things, the small farms, and the fishing, and so on.

The WITNESS: We would be glad to leave all these claims with your committee if we can have the assurance that when the commission is appointed we can have them back. They are, as it were, the brief on which we are going to be replying. They are the instructions from our clients.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: They will be in the custody of the clerk.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. I would like to ask Mr. Brewin to clear up one point. Are there any claims being made for business losses? I gather from your remarks to Mr. Smith that there are no claims for business losses, but they might be related to good-will. Now we had evidence from the custodian and from the custodian's representatives that they did not have the opportunity to buy and sell businesses as going concerns but what they sold was the assets of the business, the furniture and the fixtures and so on. Have you any comment to make on that?—A. If you are asking my personal opinion I think the good-will of the business enters into all valuations. If somebody requires me to leave suddenly and my business collapses there are principles of law by which the good-will can be estimated and I do not know of any reason why that should not be considered.

Q. Is the scope of the commission you are asking broad enough to cover that?—A. It includes the impairment of assets and loss of property and I think it would be broad enough to cover that.

Mr. GREEN: Do you think there should be a set-off or claims for moneys that were advanced to an individual?

The WITNESS: That is one thing we want the commission to investigate, yes. There are some claims. Take a man who was steadily employed and was required to be evacuated. He became virtually unemployed and his family was put more or less on relief. We do not think in those circumstances that the relief should be charged against him. We want the commission to have power to investigate things like that and determine whether they think it is fair and whether such moneys should be allowed as a set-off or not. Certainly I would think it unfair if you had taken a person's job away from him, through no fault of his own, and then charge him with the expense of keeping him and

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-99
www.nikkeimuseum.org

at the same time take it out of his property which is sold. After all, even when people are sent to jail for some crime they are not charged with their board; true, they have substantial losses, but I do not think it is a sound principle that losses which come to them through no action of their own at all; that any tangible benefit should be deducted. All we ask is that the commission should be given broad enough scope to consider and determine what are proper deductions and proper expenses to be taken off.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr. PINARD: May I ask just one question; are we going to come back this afternoon?

The CHAIRMAN: I was just going to ask if it was the wish of the committee that we sit again this afternoon.

Mr. FLEMING: I imagine the witness is about through.

Mr. MARSHALL: I have one or two questions I wanted to ask.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

By Mr. Marshall:

Q. Of this $1,000,000 of which you spoke what percentage of that would actually relate to business?—A. Well, I can break it down. There is the loss that they estimate on real estate; that will be roughly $160,000; the loss that they estimate on business they put at roughly $600,000.

Q. In the particular case about which you spoke I think $1,500 represented good-will in the business; that was included in your calculations, I take it?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, is it possible to find out how much of the $1,000,000 of the estimated loss in these 200 cases would represent good-will?—A. I could not give you that offhand.

Q. Could we get that?—A. The total here for business is $600,000, for that includes physical assets. How much of that is good-will I cannot tell without going to the forms and picking it out.

The CHAIRMAN: Would it be fair to suggest, Mr. Brewin, that of that amount 75 per cent would represent good-will?

The WITNESS: No.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I do not think we should have any guessing about this thing. I think we should have the actual figures.

The WITNESS: I am sorry we cannot give you the figures. In the case to which reference was made I would not say the figure was typical because in a good many cases good-will was not estimated. They gave the physical assets of the business. In some cases you might say that they were just hoping, if you get what I mean.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Brewin, would you tell us if you personally or anyone on your committee, investigated any of the claims submitted?

The WITNESS: I think I can say fairly that we have not investigated the claims. We are in Toronto and most of the property is in British Columbia and we have just presented the claims. We have done everything we could to keep the claims modest and reasonable, and we think on the whole we have been successful; and that is shown to be the case because in some of these claims the actual value claimed is the assessed value; which is a fairly good indication that in at least a good many cases they were very reasonable. We have not had the machinery to investigate the claims and that is why we want the commission.

Mr. BURTON: That is why you want the commission?

By the Vice-Chairman:

Q. What was the date of the president's letter to the Prime Minister of which you say you have not got a copy?—A. I am sorry, I do not know.

Q. Well we can get a copy from the Prime Minister.—A. It was just a letter saying that the Japanese-Canadians had been loyal citizens and hoping that congress would pass this bill. Am's ?

By Mr. Pinard:

Q. As far as the sale of businesses is concerned, do you think we should take this fact into consideration? If the Japanese had not been evacuated do you think they would have been able to keep their businesses as before? Due to the fact war had been declared do you think this angle should not be taken into consideration?—A. No, I do not think they should have to suffer special loss on account of the war. Many of these people about whom we are speaking are Canadian citizens, or loyal aliens, and it is perfectly true that the war situation might have reduced their property valuations or it might have increased them.

Q. I am not talking about property valuations, I am talking about the businesses.—A. As I stated, Mr. Krug in his letter, pointed out that a business that was say exporting to Japan or importing from Japan, would suffer a loss which would not arise out of the evacuation. That loss would have occurred at any rate. With regard to that sort of loss we would not press any claim because under the formula we have suggested it would not arise out of the evacuation orders. Generally speaking, however, war conditions improved values rather than reduced them.

Q. You say you sent 4,000 forms out and you got 650 answers. Do you think a portion of those who did not answer were satisfied with the situation as it was?—A. I do not think so. I think probably in some cases the claims were very small. Some of these claims we might not be able to appraise because they might depend on the loss of earnings or something like that, and because there is no perfect world from which they could recover their losses, they did not bother to send them in. I mean that people, after all, would not be bothered filling in the form and sending it in unless they were entirely dissatisfied. These reports, however, are pretty well all cases of people who feel, rightly or wrongly, that they have grievances.

Q. Yes, but there were some 4,000 who did not have any complaint?—A. A lot of the claims are confined to assessment of property losses and the younger people would not have any claims.

By the Vice-Chairman:

Q. You have expressed your opinion quite freely Mr. Brewin, would you say that the average business as carried on by the Japanese population would more or less have dried up because of the war?

Mr. FLEMING: You mean apart from the fact that the evacuation took place?

By the Vice-Chairman:

Q. If there had been no evacuation?—A. Well I do not think I am qualified to answer that question. In some cases it might have gone on, but it would depend on those special conditions that did arise, and whether it was felt that there might have been some danger in having Japanese-Canadians there. It is perfectly possible that there would have been some losses on that basis.

Q. Are there any further questions of the witness?—A. I am sorry I must explain to the committee that I have a business appointment in Windsor but the committe could hear Mr. Tanaka, who has had personal experience in all these matters.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-100
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Mr. PINARD: Are we not through with the witnesses?

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: I had hoped we might be.

Mr. FLEMING: Is there anything that Mr. Tanaka or Mrs. MacMillan want to submit to supplement the statement made by Mr. Brewin? Is there any further information that they feel is necessary or have we received it from Mr. Brewin?

Mr. TANAKA: No, there were certain instances when, if I had been asked, I could possibly have helped in the answering.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: But you are satisfied?

Mr. TANAKA: Yes, I think it has been very well presented.

Mrs. MACMILLAN: With the exception of that question you asked regarding the Baptist federation. Perhaps you are aware that two years ago the Baptist Federation of Canada was formed to unite the western and central and maritime Baptists.

Mr. GREEN: I move, Mr. Chairman, that you and Mrs. MacMillan fight that matter out.

Mr. FLEMING: I suggest that we adjourn now at the call of the chair which will be the subject of suggestion by the steering committee.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: Agreed.

The meeting adjourned at 1.20 p.m. to meet again at the call of the chair.

Appendix "A"

Form No. 1

ECONOMIC LOSS SURVEY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA EVACUEES

JAPANESE CANADIAN COMMITTEE FOR DEMOCRACY
84 Gerrard Street East, Toronto 2, Ont.

All information supplied will be treated as confidential and used only for the purposes of presenting claims for restitution.

1. Name ..... Age ..... Citizenship .....
2. Pre-evacuation Address .....
3. Present Address .....
4. Pre-evacuation Occupation .....
5. Present Occupation .....
6. *Real Estate (Residential)*:
   Street Address .....
   Legal Description (Block No., Lot No.) .....
   Year of Purchase ..... Purchase Price of Property ..... $.....
   Estimated Value of Improvements to Property ..... $.....
   Estimated Market Value of Property at Time of Evacuation ..... $.....
   Assessed Value at Time of Evacuation ..... $.....
   Estimated Present Day Market Value of Property ..... $.....
   Price Sold by Custodian ..... $.....
   What payment, if any, have you received from the Custodian? ..... $.....
   Was this property sold with your consent? Yes ..... No .....
   Are you satisfied with Custodian's sale price? Yes ..... No .....

5. Present Occupation .....
   Name of Firm ..... Type of Business .....
   Street Address .....
   Partnership; Limited Company; or Sole Proprietor:
   If either of the former, give details .....
   .....
   .....
   .....
   .....
   .....
   .....
   .....
   .....
   .....
   ..... $.....
   If Owner of Premises, State Value at Time of Evacuation ..... $.....
   Price of Premises Sold by Custodian ..... $.....
   What payment, if any, have you received from the Custodian? ..... $.....
   Estimated Value of Business at Time of Evacuation:
   (*a*) Fixtures and Equipment ..... $.....
   (*b*) Inventories of Stock ..... $.....
   (*c*) Goodwill ..... $.....
   Total ..... $..... $.....

8. *Farm Property:*
   Location .....
   Legal Description .....
   Type of Farm ..... Acreage .....
   Year of Purchase ..... Purchase Price of Farm Property $.....
   Estimated Value of Improvements ..... $.....
   Assessed Value at Time of Evacuation ..... $.....

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-101
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Estimated Market Value of Farm at Time of Evacuation:
(a) Land and Buildings ..... $.....
(b) Equipment and Supplies ..... $.....
(c) Livestock ..... $.....
(d) Crops ..... $.....

Total ..... $..... $.....
Price Sold by Custodian ..... $.....
What payment, if any, have you received from the Custodian? ..... $.....
Estimated Present Day Market Value of Property ..... $.....
Was this property sold with your consent? .....
Are you satisfied with Custodian's selling price? Yes..... No .....

9. *Fishing Vessels and Gear:*
Type of Boat .....
Length ..... Beam .....
Engine: Make ..... Horsepower .....
Estimated Market Value at Time of Evacuation ..... $.....
Price Sold by Committee or Custodian ..... $.....
What payment, if any, have you received from the Custodian? .... $.....
Estimated Present Day Market Value ..... $.....
Deductions Connected with Above Sales ..... $.....
Net Amount Received ..... $.....

9a. *Fishing Gear:*
Estimated Market Value at Time of Evacuation ..... $.....
Custodian's Selling Price ..... $.....
What payment, if any, have you received from the Custodian? ..... $.....

10. *Personal Estate:*
Estimated Market Value at Time of Evacuation:
(a) Automobile, Trucks, Etc. ..... $.....
..... $.....
Custodian's Selling Price ..... $.....
(b) Furniture, Fixtures, Radios, Cameras, Etc. ..... $.....
..... $.....
Custodian's Selling Price ..... $.....
(c) Miscellaneous ..... $.....
..... $.....
Custodian's Selling Price ..... $.....

11. *Loss of Revenue* (Rent, Income, Wages, Etc.):
1942 $ ..... 1943 $ ..... 1944 $ ..... 1945 $ ..... 1946 $ .....

12. *Accounts Uncollected* (Rent, Interest, Loan, Deposit, Claims, Etc.):
..... $.....
..... $.....

13. *Fees Paid* (Attorney or Agent, Storage, Transportation, Travelling, Medical, Education, Funeral or any other service fees which can be directly attributed to evacuation):
..... $.....
..... $.....

14. *Personal Loss Due to:* Cancellations, Abandonment of Insurance Policies, Contracts, Etc.
..... $.....
..... $.....

15. *Family Allowances and Relief Deduction.*
Had Family Allowance not been denied while in British Columbia, what total payments would have been received since
..... $.....
Were Reliefs Payments Deducted From Your Custodian Account?
If so, state amount ..... $.....

16. *Comments:*
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

To the Best of My Knowledge the Foregoing Facts are True.
Date ..... Signed .....

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-102
www.nikkeimuseum.org

SESSION 1947

HOUSE OF COMMONS

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 11

FRIDAY, MAY 30 1947

WITNESSES:

Hon. C. W. G. Gibson, Secretary of State and Custodian of Enemy Property;

Dr. E. H. Coleman, C.M.G., K.C., Deputy Custodian of Enemy Property, and Mr. K. W. Wright, Counsel.

OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., B.A., L.Ph.,
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
1947

REPORT TO THE HOUSE

TUESDAY, June 17, 1947.

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts begs leave to present the following as a

FOURTH REPORT

Your Committee held its first meeting on Monday, April 28, 1947, and this report covers the first eleven meetings, the last of which was held on Tuesday, May 27.

A steering committee, composed of the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman and Messrs. Burton, Fleming, Gibson (*Comox-Alberni*), Marshall and Stuart (*Charlotte*), was appointed to consider procedure and agenda, and its recommendations were approved by the main committee.

The first four meetings of the Committee were devoted to consideration of Bill No. 22, An Act to continue the Revised Regulations respecting Trading with the Enemy (1945). This Bill was reported to the House with amendments on May 6, 1947, and passed the House without further amendment on May 9.

The next seven meetings were devoted to a review of the general administration and liquidation of real property in British Columbia owned by Japanese evacuees. With a view to obtaining as complete a picture as possible of the Custodian's activities in this respect, the Committee heard evidence from the Hon. C. W. Gibson, Secretary of State and Custodian of Enemy Property, Dr. E. H. Coleman, C.M.G., K.C., Deputy Custodian, Mr. F. G. Shears, Director, Vancouver Office, and Mr. K. W. Wright, Counsel; from Mr. Gordon Murchison, Director, Soldier Settlement and Veterans' Land Act; from Mrs. Hugh MacMillan, Secretary, and Mr. F. Andrew Brewin, Counsel, The Cooperative Committee on Japanese Canadians, and from Mr. George Tanaka, Chairman, Japanese Canadian Committee for Democracy.

During these meetings, your Committee's enquiry was confined to a study of the Custodian's administration of the property of persons of the Japanese race as it applies to the West Coast, and more particularly to the area, known as the protected area, extending north several hundred miles from the United States Boundary and inland to the Cascade Mountains, and including Vancouver Island, the Queen Charlotte Islands and the group of small islands known as the Gulf Islands. The affairs of approximately 22,000 Japanese were involved, including the ownership of 1,700 parcels of real property as well as business, stock, equipment and household effects.

It is interesting to note that on December 10, 1941, three days after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbour that brought the United States into the war, the Custodian opened an office in Vancouver.

Evacution of persons of the Japanese race from the protected area commenced in March, 1942, and continued until October of that year. In the period between December 7, 1941, and March 27, 1942, the date of Order in Council P.C. 1665 vesting control of their property in the Custodian many Japanese disposed of property at prices which were probably considerably below the market value. Immediately upon assuming control, the Custodian commenced a voluntary registration of all Japanese property, real and personal. A printed form (Form "J.P.", a copy of which is appended) was mailed to every Japanese evacuee with the request that it be completed and returned to the Custodian.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-103
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Great difficulty was experienced by the Custodian in identifying the personal property, such as chattels and personal effects, of these 22,000 Japanese and, undoubtedly, some confusion resulted. The reasons for this confusion were explained in evidence to your Committee.

The procedure followed in respect to the listing of personal property and its transportation from owners' homes to storage and subsequent disposal was fully explained by the witnesses.

Some of the household effects and other chattels were advertised in the press and sold at public auction. From the evidence produced, there is no doubt that a certain amount of theft and vandalism took place both before control was vested in the Custodian and during the period of his administration.

Subsequent to the passage of the Order in Council establishing a protected area, two advisory committes were appointed: one under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice Sidney Smith, associated with Alderman Charles Jones of Vancouver and a Japanese representative; the other under the chairmanship of the late Judge David Whiteside, assisted by Mayor Mott, of New Westminster, Mr. D. A. Mackenzie, Mr. Harold Menzies and a Japanese representative. The Japanese representatives on the two committees resigned on being evacuated. Every negotiation for the sale of real estate was considered and reported upon by the committee over which Judge Whiteside presided.

Most of the discussion in your Committee centred around the sale of 741 farm properties by the Custodian to the Director, The Veterans' Land Act, for the sum of $836,250.

A summary of the cash which has been collected by the Custodian on behalf of Japanese evacuees, covering not only real estate but fishing vessels, fishing gear, cars and trucks, farm equipment, household effects and sundries, totals $5,373,317.64.

In view of the evidence adduced and in order that more information may be obtained as to the desirability of adjusting any apparent discrimination or loss which may have resulted from the taking over or sale of property of any kind, your Committee recommends that a commission be appointed under the provisions of the Inquiries Act to inquire into and report upon the claim of any person of the Japanese race now resident in Canada for alleged loss which resulted from the amount received by him being less than the fair market value of his property at time of sale or loss.

A copy of the minutes of proceedings and evidence to May 27 is appended.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

GORDON B. ISNOR,
Vice-Chairman

Form "JP" File No.....

OFFICE OF THE CUSTODIAN

Japanese Section

To be completed by persons of the Japanese race having property in any protected area. The proper administration of this property requires such persons to give full particulars as requested in this form.

Personal Information

Name .....
Home Address .....
Registration Number .....Sex.....Age.....
Occupation .....
.....
(If any business or businesses carried on, state where, under what name and whether carried on by yourself or in partnership with anyone; if partnership, give partner's name.)
Employer .....
Married? .....
Name of Wife or Husband .....
Address of Wife or Husband .....
Names of Any Living Children .....
.....
.....
Address of Children .....
Age of Children .....

Statement of All Real Property (Each parcel must be mentioned and particulars given)

1. Location and Description .....
.....
.....
.....
2. Buildings and Other Improvements .....
.....
.....
.....
3. Insurance (Give particulars; state where policies are) .....
.....
4. Taxes (Amount and where payable) .....
5. Encumbrances (Including any unregistered claims or deposit of title deed)
.....
.....
.....
5. Sub-Tenants, If Any (Give name, address, rent and to what date paid)..
6. Occupancy and Leases (If vacant so state).....
.....
.....

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA Library

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-104
www.nikkeimuseum.org

7. State Whereabouts of Title Documents.....
8. State if any Other Person Has any Interest.....
9. If Farm Land Crops Sown.....

Statement of Real Property Occupied

1. Location and Description.....
.....
2. Landlord's Name and Address.....
.....
3. Particulars of Lease and Rent and Date to Which Paid.....
.....
4. State Whereabouts of Lease.....
.....
.....
.....
6. If Farm Land, Particulars of Crops Sown.....
.....
.....

Statement of Personal Property Owned:

1. Give Brief Description and State Location of Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment and Machinery, Stock in Trade and Personal Effects:
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
2. Horses, Livestock and Other Animals, Poultry and Pets.....
.....
.....
.....
3. Give the Name and Address of Any Person Having Any Interest in, or Claim on Any Such Property.....
.....
.....
4. Insurance Carried on Above Property.....
.....
5. Mortgages, Liens and Other Claims on Property in Possession of Others
.....
.....
6. Moneys Owing to You (State if any of these debts assigned and if so, to whom).....
.....
.....
7. Bonds, Debentures, Shares, Stocks or Other Securities (State whereabouts)
.....
.....
8. Bank Accounts.....
9. Life Insurance.....
.....
10. Interest in Any Estates or Trusts.....
.....
11. Safety Deposit Box.....

Liabilities:

1. Personal Debts.....
.....
.....
2. Trade Debts.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

I, the undersigned, hereby voluntarily turn over to the Custodian all my property in the protected area as set out above, excepting fishing vessels, deposits of money, shares of stock, debentures, bonds or other securities, if any.

I certify that the above information is true and complete and fully discloses all my property of every description in any protected area in British Columbia and sets forth all my liabilities direct and indirect.

Dated this.....day of.....1943.

(Signature).....

.....
Witness

For Departmental Use.....

.....

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-105
www.nikkeimuseum.org

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

THURSDAY,. June 26, 1947.

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts met at 11 o'clock a.m., the Chairman, Mr. L. P. Picard, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Burton, Coté *(Verdun)*, Fleming, Fraser, Gladstone, Golding, Hamel, Homuth, Isnor, Jackman, Jaenicke, Kirk, Macdonnell, Picard, Probe, Warren, Winkler..

In attendance: Mr. Gordon Murchison, Director, Soldier Settlement and Veterans' Land Act; Mr. K. W. Wright, Counsel to the Custodian of Enemy Property.

The Chairman presented the Fourth Report of the Steering Committee, viz.:

Your Steering Committee met to-day and recommends:

1. That to-day's meeting be devoted to (*a*) questioning of Mr. Murchison respecting the resale of lands formerly owned by persons of the Japanese race, and (*b*) further questioning of Dr. Coleman and Mr. Mathieu respecting the administration of the Custodian.

2. That the Auditor General, Mr. Watson Sellar, be called for the next meeting and, following his evidence, Messrs. Murchison and William Cleave be heard during the coming week concerning the operations of the Veterans' Land Act in the Township of Sarnia, in the County of Lambton, Ontario.

On motion of Mr. Homuth:

Resolved,—That the Fourth Report of the Steering Committee be concurred in.

The Chairman reported that the following documents, promised by the Deputy Custodian at the last meeting, had been received:

copies of correspondence exchanged between the Deputy Custodian and the Deputy Minister of Reconstruction respecting royalties paid on Bren guns;

inventory of books of the Deutscher Bund Kanada held in storage by the agents of the Custodian, The Western Trust Company, Winnipeg, and

statement of royalties received by the Custodian for the account of I. G. Farbeninsdustries.

Mr. Murchison was recalled.

On motion of Mr. Fleming:

Ordered,—That the schedule showing details respecting the resale of lands formerly owned by persons of the Japanese race, submitted by Mr. Murchison and filed on June 17, be printed as *Appendix "A"* to this day's minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Questioning of Mr. Murchison was resumed.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-106
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Mr. Wright was recalled and questioned.

Mr. Murchison filed a supplementary statement to the schedule respecting the resale of Japanese lands, which, on motion of Mr. Fleming, is printed as *Appendix "B"* to this day's minutes of proceedings and evidence.

It was agreed that Dr. Coleman and Mr. Mathieu be called for the next meeting, and that Mr. Sellar be heard at the meeting next following the conclusion of their evidence.

Mr. Murchison retired.

At 1 o'clock p.m. the Committee adjourned until Friday, June 27, at 11 o'clock a.m.

A. L. BURGESS,
Clerk of the Committee.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

June 26, 1947.

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts met this day at 11.30 a.m. The Chairman, Mr. L. Philippe Picard, presided.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we have a quorum, may I call the meeting to order.

We have before us three returns that have been filed by Mr. Wright, one concerning the Bren gun, in answer to a question by Mr. Stewart; one in connection with I G Farbenindustry, also in answer to a question by Mr. Stewart; and one concerning the list of books seized which were in the hands of the Deutscherbund-Kanada.

Mr. HOMUTH: You do pretty well on that "Deutscherbund".

The CHAIRMAN: Yes? Thank you. The only statement that remains to be filed concerns the details of payments of auditors and that will be ready to-morrow, it is quite lengthy.

Before this meeting opened there was a meeting of the steering committee.

(See minutes of proceedings.)

Now gentlemen, we have with us Mr. Murchison.

Mr. FLEMING: Are you going to deal with the report of the steering committee, or the recommendation of the steering committee?

The CHAIRMAN: Does the report of the steering committee meet with the approval of the committee?

Mr. HOMUTH: I so move.

The CHAIRMAN: Moved by Mr. Homuth that the report of the steering committee meeting this morning be approved.

Carried.

Gordon B. Murchison, Director of The Soldiers' Settlement Board and Veterans' Land Act, called:

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions, of Mr. Murchison?

Mr. FLEMING: Before I put any questions, there is one matter that I would like to mention first, on a question of privilege. I have the minutes of the evidence taken at the meeting on Tuesday last, at which I was not present. With my friend, the vice-chairman of this committee, I was sojourning in Halifax. I notice there was some discussion at the opening of the meeting about the printing of a lengthy table which Mr. Murchison has submitted to the committee. I find that Mr. Murchison undertook to say, speaking of the table, "Mr. Fleming has that schedule for study and probably that is one reason why it has not been incorporated in your printed proceedings".

I want to make two comments, Mr. Chairman, on Mr. Murchison's statement. First of all there is nothing in that suggestion which he made. The fact of the matter is that the decision not to print the table was taken at the last meeting of the committee and the report of Mr. Murchison was sitting in front of you on the table when the decision was made. I borrowed the report from the

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-107
www.nikkeimuseum.org

secretary of the committee to prepare myself on it in order to save time at the next meeting. The second observation is this. I do not think that it is any part of the function of a witness appearing before a committee to make a statement of that kind which has to do with the way that the committee conducts its business. It is purely a matter for the committee's own decision and it is not a matter which requires a statement on the part of any witness. The committee is quite capable of looking after its own business without gratuitous suggestions of that kind.

Mr. ISNOR: It might be a matter of human rights.

Mr. FLEMING: What was that?

Mr. ISNOR: Nothing, let it go.

The CHAIRMAN: If I may say so, I do not think there was any discourteous intention. Mr. Murchison did not know how our business had been done and he just saw that it had not been printed. He was not in a position to know the motives.

The WITNESS: May I just make one observation? The only reason I made the statement which I did was because I had been asked by the secretary for another copy of the statement, because the one which I had previously filed had not been printed.

Mr. FLEMING: I just make this observation. At the close of our second last meeting this matter was discussed, and I urged then that the table be printed as an appendix to the proceedings. The committee thought at that time it was not yet desirable that the table be printed but the matter could be raised later. The fact that the table was in my possession had nothing whatever to do with it not being printed, because it was not in my possession when the committee reached the decision.

The CHAIRMAN: You are perfectly right.

Mr. FLEMING: As you indicated in the steering committee meeting, we want to complete our work on the sale of the Japanese property and I will try to make my questions of Mr. Murchison as brief as possible. I will renew my motion that the table be printed. You may prefer to leave that until after the examination in complete but I think it should go in. I do not think it is possible to properly follow the proceedings unless it is printed.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that is correct.

The matter of printing the table was postponed at the last meeting until the questioning was all done and the intention was that it could then be printed. It is now moved by Mr. Fleming that the schedule produced by Mr. Murchison be printed in the proceedings.

Carried.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. I may say the schedule does extend some additional information which is already tabled on the record and which was submitted by Dr. Coleman at an earlier date. It takes up that table from the point where he completed his information and then it gives the purchase price and the sale price by the V.L.A. It is additional information and this table is set up in precisely the same manner as is Dr. Coleman's table.

Have you got a copy of this before you Mr. Murchison?—A. I have one here now, the secretary has just given it to me.

Q. I will go over this as quickly as I can, Mr. Chairman. The first item I would like to ask you about it J. L. 143, that is on page 1. It is the sale to the Westminister Priory Ltd. for $5,500. I think that is one you told us about at a previous meeting where you indicated that was a sale to a purchaser other than a veteran and the purchase cost to the Soldiers' Settlement Board I think was $5,500—A. I think that is correct.

Q. The next one, if you will turn to page 8, it is partly on page 8 and partly on page 16, but it is the sale to William Minty.

The CHAIRMAN: What is the number of that sale?

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. J. L. 151 on page 8 and J. L. 147 on page 16. The note opposite these parcels is "These lots sold by public tender to William Minty for $3,050" and, if my figures are correct, the aggregate purchase price of the four parcels that were purchased by the Soldiers' Settlement Board was $433. Is that correct Mr. Murchison? I do not claim to be a finished mathematician.—A. I think I gave the particulars of that sale in my previous evidence.

Q. Would you mind giving it again now and we will have it in line with this table? On page 8, under J. L. 151 you have an item of $46, an item of $94, and an item of $198. On page 16 under J. L. 147 you have an item of $95.—A. Yes.

Q. Now does that represent the total number of parcels sold to William Minty by public tender for $3,050?—A. That is my understanding.

Q. Well is there anything to be added to that?—A. I have nothing to add to that. The total cost of the lots is listed on page 8; $94, $198, and $46; and on page 16, $96. I think that would account for the purchase price, the price paid to the custodian for those lots.

Q. That would total, according to my figuring, $434, do you agree?—A. Yes.

Q. And then on page 27 there is an item there, J. L. 693, the amount paid by the Veterans' Land Act was $1,689, sold by the Veterans' Land Act for $2,340, and the note there is "Purchase price $2,500, sale of granary for $160". That means, I take it, there was a net of $2,340 for the land, is that correct?—A. Yes.

Q. Have you anything to add to that?—A. No.

Q. Did the figure of $1,689, the purchase price when you bought it, include the granary?—A. I could not say that without looking at the file.

Q. Then the figure $1,689 that you bought might compare either with the figure of $2,340, or the figure of $2,500 as the sale price when sold by you?—A. Yes.

Q. To whom was that sold? Was it sold to a veteran on a non-veteran?—A. Without checking the actual details on the file I am convinced it was a sale to a non-veteran, otherwise the sale price would have been the cost price to the director.

Q. Well are you drawing that conclusion by way of inference or are you making that as a statement of fact, that it was sold to a non-veteran?—A. By way of inference, because I cannot make it as a statement of fact without looking at the file. I cannot carry the details of 700 parcels of land in my head.

Q. You are making it by way of inference, then can I put it this way, Mr. Murchison? If it was a sale to a non-veteran you have made a profit on it of $700 or $900 in round figures, perhaps $800 in round figures. If it was a sale to a veteran, which you do not think it was, because it was sold at a profit, that would then be out of line with the policy you followed all the way through with sales to veterans?—A. That is right.

Q. And you do not think it came within that latter class?—A. No.

Q. And then the next item is on page 30, J. L. 397. You bought it for $41 and sold it for $100 to Kennedy Community Hall Association?—A. Yes.

Q. I am offering you full opportunity to make any comment on any of these Mr. Murchison, because, you will recall your previous statement to the committee that there were only three properties, and you were very emphatic on this, that sold at a price by you, or by your department, in advance of that paid. You stated there were only three instances and you objected to a reference in one of the journals to the use of the word "examples". Now I give you an opportunity to comment on any of these if you wish to do so. Is there anything

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-108
www.nikkeimuseum.org

you wish to say on that one, J.L. 397?—No. I have nothing to comment in connection with that.

Q. That was sold at a profit, at an advance of about 250 per cent on the price at which you bought it?—A. It was bought for $41 and sold for $1[illegible].

Q. Yes, which is an advance of about 250 per cent. The next one is on page 31, J.L. 438 and it appears that you bought that for $3,682 and sold it for $4,000 and there is a note opposite that line to the effect that the purchase price was $4,000. What is the meaning of that note?—A. That means we had to increase our price to the custodian to that figure to get title.

Q. Now was that not included among the 741 parcels? How did that come to be dealt with specially?—A. That happened to be a parcel, I imagine, where the encumbrances against the title were such that it required an increase over the original figure, to the figure you have quoted, in order to get title.

Q. We have not heard of this before. We have not heard about any advance in the purchase price paid by your department on any of these parcels included among the total of the 741 farms. This is the first time we have heard that was any change made subsequently in the terms of purchase of any of these parcels.—A. Yes.

Q. Were there others or is this the only one?—A. No, there were cases where it was necessary for us to make modest increases in order to secure title.

Q. Why was that necessary, in order to secure title?—A. It was because we could not get title otherwise because the encumbrances against the land were such that the custodian could not deliver title for the purchase price first offered. We deemed, in those cases, it was good business on our part to agree to a modest increase in price up to an amount that would produce title.

Q. Do you mean to say you went back and increased prices to the custodian?—A. That is right.

Q. Because we have heard nothing about that from Mr. Shears in his evidence?—A. There were very few cases but there were some where it was a matter of either dropping the sale or increasing the purchase price to secure title.

I wish you would be more explicit as to why the sale price would be varied because I understood the custodian had the equivalent of a statutory title, in the order in council passed under the War Measures Act. Would you just tell the committee how those increased prices became necessary in order to dispose of encumbrances for purposes of completing sale to veterans?—A. I do not know whether I can make it perfectly clear. I think I could perhaps best describe it this way. The total purchase price offered the custodian for the 769 parcels was allocated in accordance with our appraised value. As I said to this committee before, the total appraised value was approximately $17,000 in excess of the offer the custodian accepted for the 769 parcels. In the course of taking titles to individual parcels I have no doubt the custodian allocated specific amounts to each parcel on account of each Japanese. Now in doing that they found in a few cases the allocation to the purchase price was not sufficient to clear the title on that individual parcel and accordingly we increased our purchase price by a few hundred dollars in order to obtain title.

Q. Mr. Murchison, I take it the custodian was conveying to you subject to encumbrances, and, in the case of some parcels, certain questions were raised about encumbrances and there were some adjustments necessary?—A. That is right.

By Mr. Jaenicke:

Q. Is that answer correct? Was the conveyance subject to encumbrances?—A. No, it was not subject to encumbrances.

Q. That was the question.—A. It was transferred to us in fee simple but in order to acquire title in some cases our purchase price had to be increased by small amounts in order to enable the custodian to deliver title.

The CHAIRMAN: We have Mr. Wright, counsel for the custodian, who is here, and he might clear that up.

Mr. WRIGHT: The custodian took title subject to any mortgages, taxes, and subject to other encumbrances and at the close of the deal, just before it was closed, I recall that we submitted a list of those properties where the offer was not sufficient to take care of the adjustments necessary to obtain title. I cannot furnish you with the details but they were not numerous.

Mr. FLEMING: That is the case where the purchase price did not cover the encumbrances?

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes, that was the only case, and that information can be supplied to you.

Mr. FLEMING: Thank you then Mr. Wright. We may take it in all cases, and they were not numerous, where the purchase price offered by the Veterans' Land Act was not adequate to cover the encumbrances, the Veterans' Land Act subsequently increased the purchase price on the particular parcel by an amount sufficient to cover the encumbrances?

Mr. WRIGHT: Not in all cases. They refused in more than one case.

Mr. FLEMING: Who refused?

Mr. WRIGHT: The director of the Veterans' Land Act refused, in a number of cases, to pay the required amount so the offer with respect to that particular parcel was withdrawn, and those would be included in the properties we afterwards sold by public tender.

Mr. FLEMING: It all comes down to this, eventually, of the total number of parcels sold by the custodian to the Veterans' Land Act, in no case was the purchase price increased except in the odd case where the encumbrances exceeded the amount of the purchase price.

Mr. WRIGHT: Where the director of the Veterans' Land Act desired to obtain title.

Mr. FLEMING: Were there any cases included in the 741, I am not speaking of the 769 but in the eventual 741, where the director of the Veterans' Land Act did not choose to pay the additional amount required because of the encumbrances?

Mr. WRIGHT: Not in those they actually acquired.

Mr. FLEMING: We may take it in all those cases the director of the Veterans' Land Act did increase his price to cover the encumbrances?

Mr. WRIGHT: In the case of all those he eventually secured title to, yes. Otherwise we would not have conveyed.

Mr. BURTON: Would Mr. Wright be able to tell us how many parcels would be involved in those increases?

Mr. WRIGHT: I can obtain that information from Vancouver but I have not got it today.

Mr. FLEMING: Can you find out the amount of the increases? I take it there would not be very many.

Mr. WRIGHT: I believe we could go through the records and obtain that information.

Mr. BURTON: Mr. Murchison would be able to tell us this. Were the veterans to whom those lands were sold charged with the increase paid to the custodian?

The WITNESS: Yes.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-109
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Mr. BURTON: With the result that "A" bought a piece of land from the custodian that had been free of encumbrances for $100?

The WITNESS: That is right.

Mr. BURTON: And "B", buying adjoining property that was worth approximately the same amount, owing to the fact that there had been encumbrances on it, was forced to pay $150.

The WITNESS: That is possible.

Mr. ISNOR: But, on the other hand, the Veterans' Land Act may have purchased it for $75 but the encumbrances might have brought it up to $100.

Mr. JAENICKE: Are you asking this in connection with the 741 parcels?

Mr. FLEMING: Yes.

Mr. JAENICKE: Does not the list show how much the increases were?

Mr. FLEMING: No, the list shows first of all the J. L. number, and then the name of the owner, the appraisal by the Soldiers' Settlement Board valuators, then the sale price.

Mr. JAENICKE: Upon which the price is based.

Mr. FLEMING: That is the price paid by the Soldiers' Settlement Board to the custodian. Then column 5 is the V.L.A. file number, and the sixth column is the price sold for by the V.L.A., the seventh column is headed "Remarks", and there are remarks opposite some cases.

Mr. JAENICKE: It has not got a column showing the expenditures made by the V.L.A. on some parcels for the building of houses and things like that.

Mr. FLEMING: There would be an opportunity to put that in the remarks column if it was necessary.

Mr. ISNOR: What is the total number of cases included in that report?

Mr. FLEMING: I have not counted them all. I take it they are the 741 which correspond with the total purchases made. I am going by Mr. Shears' statement which was printed in the record by reason of a motion by Mr. Cruickshank.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Just before leaving that, Mr. Murchison, in those cases where you raised the price, you were prepared to raise the price paid to the custodian in order to get title to the property?—A. Yes.

Q. And this is one case where you were prepared to raise the price from $3,682 to $4,000 in order to obtain that parcel?—A. That is right.

Q. Now you mentioned that the purchase price was $4,000 in the remarks column. I take it that was sold to a veteran.—A. No, that remark means it was the purchase price paid to the custodian. What page is that on?

Q. Page 31, item J.L. 438. It is the last item that has a remark on it on the page.—A. Yes.

Q. Do I infer from that it was sold to a veteran for $4,000?—A. Yes, it is listed in the appropriate column as sold to a veteran for $4,000.

Q. Mr. Wright, I take it Mr. Chairman, will give particulars of those amounts and the increases. This is the first we have heard of it.

Now on page 34 there is an item I would like to ask you about. It is J.L. 462 at the bottom of the page. The Veterans' Land Act paid $1,611 and sold what we are told was part only to the Secretary of State for $1. What is the explanation?—A. I am sorry, I would have to look at the individual file to explain that to you.

Q. I would be obliged if you would do that as it is the first we have heard of a sale back to the custodian. This is a piece of property which was sold back to the Secretary of State for $1.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand Mr. Wright has particulars on that.

Mr. FLEMING: I would stop now and ask Mr. Wright if he would explain?

Mr. WRIGHT: I have not the details, but relying on my memory, we sold a parcel out in Mission, to the director. It was a corner lot and on the corner property was a building which belonged to an association.

Mr. FLEMING: What kind of an association?

Mr. WRIGHT: One of the Japanese associations. We arranged with the director to have sufficient land returned to the Secretary of State in order that we might have land for the building and not be required to move it. We found that the orders in council which were passed did not cover association properties and we could not convey.

Mr. FLEMING: In other words the order in council touched only the property of individuals?

Mr. WRIGHT: That is correct.

Mr. FLEMING: And this was a matter of a formal transaction, with the $1 consideration being purely a formal recital.

Mr. WRIGHT: In order to have enough land to avoid moving the building this transaction was put through.

Mr. FLEMING: Was that conveyed to the Secretary of State as the custodian of enemy property? I was wondering how the Secretary of State enters into it.

Mr. WRIGHT: In all conveyances the Secretary of State, acting in his capacity as custodian, conveys. We usually put in the transfer "The Secretary of State acting a custodian pursuant to the revised regulations".

Mr. FLEMING: Very well, we can take it this conveyance was obtained from the Veterans' Land Act by the custodian in order to rectify a sale where he had stepped beyond his powers in selling property that was not vested in him.

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes, in so far as the building referred to is concerned.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. The next item I wish to ask about is on page 35, J.L. 463. Mr. Murchison, your department paid $678 and we are told it was sold by you for $231.85 and in the remarks column it says "Purchase price $800, one part sold (BC/2406-B), one part remaining subdivision—see appendix 3".—A. Yes.

Q. Will you explain the purchase price? I will repeat that there is a reference to an appendix. Are we to understand the $800 was for a group of parcels and this item represents a particular parcel covered by the number J.L. 463?—A. I am sorry to take up your time but I would like to see the reference to the appendix referred to in the remarks column.

Q. I have looked at appendix 3 and I do not see parcel J.L. 463 included in it, Mr. Murchison.—A. Neither do I. I have an explanatory note on another appendix. In the case of 463 the custodian's sale price was $678 and the actual purchase price paid was $800. The explanatory note is that the custodian was unable to deliver title and the offer was cancelled. It was subsequently bought in December 1944 at $800.

Q. In other words you did eventually realize $800 on the sale of this parcel?—A. Not yet, we have made a partial sale of that lot for $231.85 and the balance of it is in a remaining subdivision which has not been sold.

Q. I do not quite follow you. Where does the $800 figure come from?—A. I have just explained at the outset the purchase price allocated to that lot was $678, but the custodian was unable to deliver title at that price and our offer for that parcel was cancelled. Those were negotiations in 1943 and it was subsequently bought in December 1944 at $800.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-110
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Q. You bought it from the custodian at $800. Was that included then in the original 741?—A. It would not be included with the original 741 but it would included in the final list of Japanese property acquired.

Q. This was one where we can take it, as far as the total amount paid by you to the custodian was concerned, it was not included in the 741 for which you paid something like $848,000 approximately? I am just quoting that figure from memory. This was the subject matter of a subsequent purchase negotiated between you and the custodian, and, whereas the price on the basis of the 741 purchased by you would have been $678, later, when you buy it from the custodian as a result of negotiations, for that particular parcel you are willing to pay $800?—A. Yes, a year later, over a year.

Q. I take it if there had been any others included—by the way, were there any others in the same class, purchases made by you subsequent to the conclusion of the 741 parcels?—A. Speaking from memory I believe there were a few, not a large number. There were those which were excluded or dropped from the first offer for reasons—1, that the custodian could not deliver title, or 2, that the purchase price was beyond what we were prepared to pay. I would say that this was a case when a year later, the custodian was disposing of this by public tender, we decided to accept it at $800 whereas in the first place our offer was listed at $648. The number of cases similar to that would be limited.

Q. May I ask if Mr. Wright has a note of those particular parcels so we can see what advances there were in the prices?

Mr. WRIGHT: I have not a list of those, Mr. Fleming, but in our return it is shown that the Veterans' Land Act paid $836,256 and that might not include any subsequent offers made. There were very few.

Mr. FLEMING: May I take it there were a few of those parcels that were the subject matter of sales subsequently arranged and not included in the 741, but included in the figure of $836,000?

Mr. WRIGHT: That is possible.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Now that is something new, Mr. Chairman, I think we want to get to the bottom of that. We have understood all along, I say to both Mr. Murchison and Mr. Wright, that the figure of $836,000 was calculated on a *pro rata* basis on all 741 properties; I say pro rata with reference to the appraisal made by the Solders' Settlement Board valuators.—A. 768.

Q. And that was cut down to 741?—A. It was finally cut down to 741.

Q. Do I understand from Mr. Wright's last statement, included in the 741 there were some where the price was advanced for one reason or other beyond the price for which it would have been purchased on the *pro rata* basis?—A. Yes, and, if you will bear with me, I have some notes here which I think will cover the point you are raising.

Q. Is that a new table?—A. No, it is not.

Q. Is it in the statement?—A. Yes. On the custodian's file J.L. 145, the listed price was $1,352. Our note is the custodian was unable to deliver title and the parcel with withdrawn. It was subsequently bought in December, 1944, at $1,425, as against $1,352, the original figure. Item 173 of the custodian's file; the original sale price was $1,132 and there was an error in computation. Our actual purchase price was $426 because there was a fire loss recovered by the custodian before the director got title to the land.

Q. That was an adjustment to the agreed price, it was not a change?—A. No. Our file number 180 shows the custodian's sale price was $2,041. Now the original appraisal covered two lots. The custodian was unable to deliver title to one lot and therefore we purchased the other one for $1,465. There is a case where the custodian's records show the sale price as $2,041 whereas the actual price paid by the director was $1,465 on only one lot of that property. In file

number 175 there is a minor bookkeeping omission. The quoted sale price in the custodian's return was $1,489.90 but the actual price paid was $1,489, a difference of 90 cents. In connection with J.L. 123, that is another case where there were two lots involved in the appraisal in the one property. The sale price listed by the custodian was $2,054 and here again the custodian was able to deliver title to only one lot and, therefore, we paid $1,600 for that lot to which he was able to give us title. On item J.L. 693 the listed sale price was $1,689. This was a case where the custodian was unable to deliver title. The original offer was cancelled and the parcel was later bought in January of 1946 by the director for $2,500 from the custodian. I would just point out there that approximately two and a half years had elapsed between the original offer and the time we had actually purchased the property, during which time there was a very great change took place in conditions. Item 438 shows the listed price by the custodian as $3,682. This was a case where the custodian was unable to deliver title and the parcel was withdrawn. It was subsequently purchased in July 1945 by the director at $4,000.

Q. That is one we have already had.—A. Yes. In connection with item J. L. 447 there is a difference there of $10 between the price quoted by the custodian and the price paid by the director. $42 is the price quoted by the custodian while $32 is our record of the actual price paid. On file J. L. 463, you have dealt with that one before, the custodian's price was $678 but it was subsequently bought by the director in December 1944 at $800. File 474 has I think a typographical error. The custodian's sale price is listed at $3,004, and the actual price paid was $3,044. File 522 shows the listed price by the custodian as $591 and our records show a purchase price there are $491. File J. L. 612 shows the listed price by the custodian as $5,246. That is recorded in our books as being withdrawn at the time but it was brought by the director in August 1945 at $6,000. Now that is all the information I have as to any increase in prices which took place following subsequent negotiations.

The CHAIRMAN: If I may say something at this point, I understand from Mr. Wright, that would be the only information he could get from Vancouver if he requested it. I think, however, that it covers the point.

Mr. FLEMING: I would suggest before we go any further that the table which Mr. Murchison has just read be printed in our records and Mr. Wright can check it. If he does find there is anything inaccurate he can report it to you and we will have it complete both from Mr. Murchison and Mr. Wright.

The CHAIRMAN: The table will be included in our records.

The WITNESS: I would not like to have it thought the figures I quoted cast any reflection on the custodian or Mr. Wright's department. These figures are as taken from our records and there are obviously a few bookkeeping omissions in them, but I would be very glad to produce the statement here so that it can be checked.

Mr. FLEMING: I think that it ought to be printed.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fleming has moved that the table be printed. Is it carried?

Carried.

Mr. WRIGHT: In our return, which is included in the report, there is an item of $836,256, from the Director, the Veterans' Land Act, and the next item with respect to the sales of real estate is $1,868,080.66. Some of those subsequent sales may have been included in the second item, and might not refer to the Veterans' Land Act item. This would have to be cleared up by our Vancouver office. I could get that information.

Mr. FLEMING: I think it would be well to do that. Some of these advanced prices referred to in Mr. Murchison's table might not be reflected in the figure of $836,000 odd.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-111
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Mr. WRIGHT: They might be reflected in the second item and I will endeavour to clarify that.

Mr. FLEMING: The next item is on page 41, J. L. 539, Mr. Murchison.

Mr. JAENICKE: What is the name?

Mr. FLEMING: Okimi.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. There has not been any figure given of the sale by the Veterans' Land Act but the remark is "sold by official administrator". Can you explain that?—A. That would be a case where the property was in the hands of the administrator of the mentally incompetent and it was excluded.

Q. This would be one of those that were dropped when you reduced the gross of 769 to the net of 741?—A. That is correct.

Q. Then on the same page, J. L. 612, there is a list of properties that belong to the River Fish Company Ltd?—A. Yes.

Q. The sale price when sold to you by the custodian was a total of $5,049. $118; $79; which I make to be a total of $5,246. There is no note here of a sale by the Veterans' Land Act administration but the remark is "total purchase price for three parcels $6,000". Can you explain that Mr. Murchison, please?—A. I can only assume, sir, it was a case where it was necessary to increase the purchase price.

Q. In other words you are still holding the parcel?—A. Yes.

Q. The custodian has presumably received $6,000 perhaps for adjustments or for some other reason. The next one is on page 46, J. L. 795. There are two items under 795, the first parcel was purchased by you from the custodian for $2,926, and the second one was apparently purchased for $245. Your statement shows that the first one apparently has not been sold but that the second one for which you paid $245 was sold for $2,000 to Henry Frederick Hollings, civilian, as 'a cash sale.—A. I think that was one case I referred to in my opening statement in my evidence before the committee. It was a bush lot on Salt Spring Island.

Q. We are quite clear then that the original parcel for which you paid $2,926 you are still holding?—A. That is right.

Q. While the second item, for which you paid $245, you sold for $2,000 cash to Henry Hollings, a civilian.—A. I believe that sale was made last year.

Q. You have attached to your table some seventeen appendices. I do not know that I would like to take the time to comment on all those in detail but if there is any general explanation on those I think it would be useful to the committee if you would give it? Number one is the Haney subdivision. You put a number of these parcels together, 39 lots in all and you paid a total of $6,634 for the land, you sold the twenty lots for $6,106.59 and you are holding nineteen lots to realize a small balance of $527.41?—A. Yes.

Q. You are going to make a profit on those, obviously, when you sell them, do you not think, Mr. Murchison—A. No, because the lots which have been sold are the most attractive. Those which remain are rather outlying and bush covered and it would be our intention, if those lots are to be sold to veterans, they would be sold for what remains against the account.

Q. I take it when you put together a group of parcels for the purpose of a subdivision, when you sold the individual lots to veterans, you sold on a new plan and not by the old description? Am I right in that?—A. Yes.

Q. Therefore, when you made your individual sales on the new plan to veterans, you did not sell them or could not sell them on the basis on which you bought the lots.—A. Not in all cases. It would depend on the subdivision plan.

Q. I take it, in very rare cases only, a lot in the new plan would be identical with the lot on the old plan when you bought it?—A. Yes, but I [illegible] shown in the first appendix, in the

sales that have already been made in that Haney subdivision, existing improvements, permanent improvements, are valued at $4,800 and were included in two lots which were sold. That takes up a very large amount for the twenty lots sold.

Q. Very well, we come down to this. Apart from this statement of improvements you have made, you have realized from the sale of twenty lots practically the entire purchase price, and you have nineteen lots left which you are prepared to sell. Are you prepared to sell those to veterans for $527.41 or would it have to be $527.41 plus the $4,800?—A. $527. The $4,800 are included in two lots already sold.

Q. Are those amounts in addition to the $6,059?—A. No it is represented by the sale of the twenty lots sold.

Q. Let us get that quite clear. The amount owing against the remaining nineteen lots, as far as your department is concerned, is $521 or is it a total of the $521 plus the $4,800?—A. The $521.

Q. That is all you have to get out of the lots to break even?—A. That is all.

Q. I take it what you said about the Haney subdivision will apply to the other cases? It will be a very rare case where a lot you sold to a veteran would be identical to the lots as you acquired it from the custodian?—A. Yes.

Q. And therefore, there is not, as regards these properties, any immediate available yardstick, by which you could measure whether you have sold to a veteran at the price at which you bought?—A. No more than I can give you my assurance that the price paid for the lot was properly apportioned impartially on the sales to veterans. That is something for which we must take the responsibility.

Q. I know it is your responsibility but I want to understand that clearly. In the case where you sold the parcel under the same description under which you purchased it from the custodian, it is a simple matter for us to compare the price at which you bought it and the price at which you sold it to the veteran who was getting the benefit of the low price at which you purchased it, but, in the case of these lands which were grouped together and re-subdivided, it is not possible for us to have a ready yardstick for comparison. It is a matter of your system as to whether the veteran paid any more than a fair value to be assigned to that particular lot on a new plan?—A. That is right.

Q. Then on appendix number 2 you have acquired a total of thirty lots for $4,847 and you sold twenty-six of those lots for $3,912. You have also four lots to be sold at $935.—A. Yes.

Q. In appendix number 3 it is shown you bought thirty lots for a total of $15.453 and you sold eighteen lots for $14,508.80. You have twelve to be sold, which you are holding for $945.—A. Yes.

Q. In the fourth subdivision there were seven lots which you acquired for $4,937. You sold two lots for $5,590 and you are holding four lots for $1,346.05.—A. I think you have quoted me incorrectly. The total cost price was $4,937 and two lots were sold—

Q. Three lots were sold in the subdivision and I gave you the figure of $3.590.—A. I thought you said $5,000.

Q. No $3,590.95.

Mr. JAENICKE: You said $5,000.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. I am sorry, I was making a mental addition but you are holding four lots for $1,346.05.—A. That is right.

Q. I take it you are not going to lose anything on this subdivision?

The CHAIRMAN: Why should they lose anything?

Mr. FLEMING: Just a moment please.

The WITNESS: No, I do not think we will.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-112
www.nikkeimuseum.org

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. If you are not aiming to make anything on the subdivision, there is a great difference in the lots on this plan and somebody is going to get the remaining lots for much less than the purchasers of the first lots which were sold?—A. I do not think that has been shown at all. As I say, we paid $4,800 of the $6,600 which is represented by improvements on two lots. There was another one a moment ago where the sales of the lots totalled $14,508.80 out of a total cost of $15,461 for the bunch. In those sales, improvements valued at $13,100 were included in seven of the lots sold.

By Mr. Jaenicke:

Q. Have they all been sold in that case?—A. No, there are twelve lots left.

Q. Have you got a sample of where you have a subdivision sold, all of it?—A. No.

Q. Showing what you paid for them, what improvements you made, and what the soldiers paid to you?—A. I have not got such a sample.

Q. There are always some left?—A. There will be some left until the tag ends are picked up. Obviously the most attractive pieces are in demand first.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I need take the time of the committee to go over these appendices. This is all to be printed and it is part of Mr. Murchison's statement. It shows in each case where there was a subdivision, the number of lots on the new plan which have been sold and the part remaining?—A. That is right.

Q. We will just take another as an example. Here is number 16. This is a case where there were seven lots that cost the D.V.A. $1,375 and six have been sold for a total price of $1,297.80. One lot remains to be sold for $77.20.—A. That is probably all it is worth.

Q. Well do you know the lot? Are you saying that of your own personal knowledge?—A. No, I am saying that from the figures I see before me.

Q. It is an inference you are drawing from the figures?—A. Yes.

Q. Well let us confine ourselves to actual knowledge.

Mr. JAENICKE: All those lots do not show improvements? There was talk about the Veterans' Land Act putting on improvements in some of these places. Does that show in the statement?

Mr. FLEMING: There are just two subdivisions out of seventeen where improvements are made.

The WITNESS: Let me correct that, sir. They are not improvements made by the director of the Veterans' Land Act, they are improvements which existed on the property when it was taken over by the custodian. None of those sale prices to veterans represented any improvements made by the director, or on behalf of the director.

Mr. JAENICKE: But you told us a few meetings ago that the veteran might have paid several hundreds or thousands more for the property because you put improvements on it?

The WITNESS: Yes, when we come to sell bare land to veterans there might be an increase reflected by putting up a home or buildings.

Mr. JAENICKE: But the construction and the cost of it is separate from the figures you have given to-day.

The WITNESS: Yes.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. I think you have made that quite clear. The reason I mentioned the comparison I am seeking, is to try and draw a basis, or a line, respecting those sold with those which are left. Coming to the last appendix, number 17, I take that as an example that comes within the question asked by Mr. Jaenicke. There were four properties of Japanese apparently taken in that subdivision grouped together at a total cost price to the Veterans' Land Act of $2,210, and the note is that these lands were sold to the Corporation of the District of Surrey as a sewage disposal plan, sale price $2,800—A. Yes.

Q. Did the sale embrace all the properties shown in appendix 17?—A. Yes.

Q. And therefore on this you made a profit of approximately $600 on the sale?—A. I would not call it a profit sir, I think we quite legitimately took into consideration carrying charges, administrative charges, and so on, from the time we took over the land.

Q. Now Mr. Murchison, that is a new angle which you bring up. You were asked previously when you were before the committee about cases of sales of any of these properties acquired from the custodian where there had been an advance of the sale price; when you sold over the price at which you bought—

Mr. ISNOR: To veterans?

Mr. FLEMING: These are sold to non-veterans. Three instances were given by Mr. Murchison with respect to sales of non-veterans.

Mr. ISNOR: But the question was asked him in connection with veterans.

Mr. FLEMING: The answer given to us by Mr. Murchison was with respect to sales to non-veterans, the first one was the Westminister Priory, the second was Mr. Hollings and I forget the name of the third one.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. In any event this is another one, Mr. Murchison, which you bought for $2,210 and you have sold it to the District of Surrey for $2,800.—A. Yes.

Q. That one was not mentioned to us and you took strong exception to the use in certain quarters of the word "examples" as applied to the three instances you gave. Now you and Mr. Wright have given explanations, on several of these parcels, which I think called for an explanation in view of the remarks attached on your statement, and it looks in the net result as if there were about a dozen of these parcels altogether, or close to a dozen,—I am not saying that figure exactly—where the sale by your department was at a price in advance of that at which you bought? Now have you any comment to make on that Mr. Murchison?—A. I was speaking from the best information that had been given to me by my departmental officers when I made my statement.

Q. Well, Mr. Murchison, in fairness to the committee you did not say then that you were going on information given to you by someone else. You were very positive, so positive that you came back a second day and made a statement in very emphatic terms on the subject. Now it appears that your statement was incorrect and that there have been a number of other parcels, that I have mentioned that I think would number about a dozen, that were sold by your department at a price in advance of the price you paid for them.—A. I do not think there were a dozen. I do not think you can find a dozen in these schedules.

Q. I am not saying it is an exact dozen but I have given you about a dozen examples this morning in the review we have made, and I am asking you now if you do not think the statement you made at the previous meeting was incorrect? It does not matter for a moment on whose information it was given.—A. I will admit the statement was incorrect in so far as the three parcels being sold in advance of the price they were purchased for is concerned.

Q. That is the question you were asked and that is the statement on which you were so emphatic to the committee. I am speaking of the sales to non-

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-113
www.nikkeimuseum.org

veterans in advance of prices paid by the V.L.A. and I am now content with your statement when you say that it was incorrect.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions of Mr. Murchison?

I do not want the following remarks to be construed as a reflection on Mr. Fleming's examination this morning but, as the chairman is entitled to express an opinion, I cannot see where all this leads us, except to the conclusion that there might be a correction to the statement he made the previous time.

Mr. HOMUTH: Just a moment.

The CHAIRMAN: I am not passing any judgment, I will give you an opportunity to speak when I am through.

Mr. HOMUTH: Well I would like—

The CHAIRMAN: I am just expressing a personal opinion, I am entitled to do that just as is anybody else.

Mr. FLEMING: I take exception, Mr. Chairman, to that. If the time has come for general argument in the committee or general discussion, then it is within your prerogative to lead off on that discussion.

The CHAIRMAN: I have already asked if there are any other questions and before the witness goes out I can express an opinion. I cannot see that there has been anything wrong disclosed in this morning's questions or anything that would be against the public interest.

Mr. FLEMING: I just want to express this thought. If there are no other questions Mr. Murchison, may be excused as a witness and we are perfectly at liberty to discuss this.

The CHAIRMAN: I have asked the members if they had any other questions and there were none. I am now expressing an opinion which I should be entitled to express.

Mr. JAENICKE: Have you read the previous evidence in connection with the matter?

The CHAIRMAN: I have.

Mr. JAENICKE: You have?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, perhaps not all of it but most of it.

Mr. JAENICKE: The purpose of Mr. Fleming's examination was to show that the Veterans' Land Act might have made profits out of soldiers on the sales, and that we have got to investigate. We have made a report as far as the Japanese are concerned and that is done with.

Mr. FLEMING: No, it is not done with. Our report has been submitted to the House, or I should say it will go before the House when Mr. Isnor moves adoption of it. We had not completed the evidence on which we are basing the report and Mr. Cruickshank, in a motion, asked for the information which has been produced. There are two things here in my submission. We have additional evidence, and this is a matter of argument, and if we are now having argument, I say the additional evidence is to the effect that the price paid by the Veterans' Land Act administration to the custodian for them any Japanese owners was not a fair price, and again, that some of those prices show an advance.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it inferred that there was not a fair price?

Mr. FLEMING: We had some evidence and this is additional evidence pointing to that very fact. We had in the former evidence three cases where Mr. Murchison intimated there were sales at prices in advance of those at which he bought. Now we find, and I have brought them out, that there were around a dozen. It has also been shown, I submit, that the prices paid to the custodian by the director of the Veterans' Land Act were not fair prices representing the market value of those properties.

Mr. JAENICKE: I agree with you there.

Mr. FLEMING: In the second place, Mr. Murchison's statement on a previous occasion, was to the effect those three properties, which he then said were all the properties sold to civilians at prices in advance of those paid by the director of the Veterans' Land Act. There has been no attempt made to pass over to the Japanese owners the benefit of that sale at an increased price. Now we find that there are not just three, but there are others, and still no attempt has been made to return to the original owners the proceeds of the sales at higher prices. I think there is also an important question in the light of the proceedings of the committee, where a witness came before the committee and was very emphatic about the three sales. He came back at the next meeting and made a statement at some length with very great emphasis which, I think we felt should not have been before the committee but it went on the record. Mr. Murchison objected in the strongest terms, scathing terms, to the use of the word "examples" as applied to those three sales on the basis that there were only three. On that basis, and with that objection, he took up the time of the committee to belabour a journalist, a prominent member of the press gallery, respected by all of us, for using that expression. Now we find there were not only three examples, there were ten or a dozen. I think further we should go into this very carefully by reason of the fact that one department is dealing with another, for which the government, at cabinet level takes the responsibility, and very grave injustice has been done to people who could not protect themselves, namely these Japanese owners.

Mr. JAENICKE: I would like to state my opinion on a matter which Mr. Fleming has raised. The unfortunate publicity which we got was because the Veterans' Land Act was accused of selling soldiers land for higher prices than those at which the parcels were bought. I do not think the evidence establishes that.

Mr. FLEMING: I do not think that was ever the question.

Mr. JAENICKE: There were some sales to private individuals that were considerably more than the price paid and I say that the Japanese owners should be compensated, as we have already recommended. I, myself, was not satisfied with the report however.

Mr. ISNOR: Were you not here when the report was approved?

Mr. JAENICKE: Unfortunately I was in another committee.

Mr. ISNOR: It is unfortunate because it was unanimously approved.

Mr. JAENICKE: So I understand.

Mr. ISNOR: There is no understanding about it, it is a fact.

Mr. JAENICKE: I think it could be made plainer. The strongest evidence we have concerning the Veterans' Land Act and the fact that the property was bought too cheaply is at page 115 and 116 where these forty-three parcels were sold to private individuals for $82,000 as against the offer of the Veterans' Land Act for $38,000. That, in my opinion, is the strongest evidence we have before this committee that the offer of the Veterans' Land Act was away below the actual value. The three, or four, or half a dozen, or dozen, parcels which have been mentioned to-day are only additional evidence, as far as I can see, that the Japanese owners ought to be compensated and the matter should be investigated by parliament through a commission.

Mr. WARREN: I have been wondering if Mr. Fleming is trying to indicate or to prove that it is something of a crime that some of these properties were sold at an advance of price to civilians. Has a crime been committed?

Mr. HOMUTH: Well it ought to go back to the individual owners.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-114
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Mr. Fleming: We should not have been told there were not other sales of this kind with such emphasis.

The Chairman: There was also a great lapse of time during which there were taxes and administrative costs mounting up while they had the land.

Mr. Fleming: That has not got anything to do with this at all.

Mr. Probe: The director of the Veterans' Land Act himself was prepared to raise his figure in purchasing certain of these properties to a point where his price exceeded the appraisal which his department put on the land. I think that is an important point, because it suggests, to my mind, that his appraisal had been exceedingly modest in setting the value on the various parcels on which the director offered to purchase. The director himself was perfectly satisfied that he could afford to pay more, because he did so for certain parcels. I did not intend to break in on the trend of the question but that was one thing that ran through my mind. The director himself thought he could pay more without doing an injustice to the clients he represented. I wondered if Mr. Murchison would care to comment on that?

The Witness: Mr. Chairman, I think, from the information I have presented here, that in any case where there was an increase agreed to, the amount was comparatively small. Without checking the details it is my impression that in no case was the increase in an individual parcel more than about ten per cent.

Mr. Probe: But undoubtedly you felt you had a safety margin and you could offer more?

The Witness: Yes, but in many cases where an additional price was demanded we declined to pay. The number of cases where we agreed to increase was, after all, very limited in relation to the over-all size of the transaction.

Mr. Homuth: Might I ask Mr. Isnor when he is going to move adoption of the report.

Mr. Isnor: I was going to move it last Friday, but at the request of Mr. Fleming, a member of the committee who is very interested in the work, I postponed making the motion on that day.

Mr. Fleming: Thursday was the day.

Mr. Isnor: Yes, Thursday. Now that Mr. Fleming has returned I think it will be done in the very near future.

Mr. Fleming: I think I would like to add that, when speaking to Mr. Isnor on the matter of moving it on Thursday, a meeting was being called on Friday to hear Mr. Murchison's evidence. I was here on Friday but Mr. Isnor and I agreed there was not much point in moving it when there was another meeting to finish up the evidence. Mr. Isnor very kindly agreed with that, and he and I both took it just as a matter of convenience.

Mr. Macdonnell: I have been away but I would like to ask a question. If I had been here I would have had the information, but is it the feeling that where an additional amount was received by the authorities over and above that given to the original owners, notwithstanding the considerations which have arisen, that any advance should go to the original owners?

Mr. Jaenicke: There was a suggestion in the correspondence but I do not think it was contained in the agreement. There is some evidence that the Veterans' Land Act would turn over any profits.

Mr. Macdonnell: Would it be proper for this committee to express such a view and would that be the view?

The Chairman: I think that has been more or less covered by our recommendation that an inquiry be held and a commission be set up to hear the claims. Those claims can come before the commission which we have

Mr. Isnor: It is a big question which is raised by Mr. Macdonnell. We have discussed it at some length and I doubt whether it would be wise to reopen the question to-day. The purchases were made in 1941 and the sales made in 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945, and 1946. Naturally prices have increased and I think the committee felt that was a feature which would have to be taken into consideration by the commissioner or the commission.

The Chairman: There is another angle to it. If we are to extend the benefit to the first owner of any advance in price, we might be led to consider what the actual price is now. The actual price is even higher now, and I understand many of the individuals who purchased from the department have sold at a profit. If the Japanese could say the real value of our land would be so much now, it would open a wide field. I think that is one of the things which should be in the hands of the commission which would hear the cases and make representations to the government. Are there any other comments?

Mr. Golding: Did you have some comment Mr. Chairman?

The Chairman: I think the only point is that it is quite late. We better not call the other witnesses and I move that we adjourn until to-morrow morning at 11.00 a.m. to hear Dr. Coleman and Mr. Mathieu. Mr. Fleming was not here when they appeared and I understand the other members were all through, but we agreed to postpone the balance of their evidence so Mr. Fleming could ask questions. I move that we adjourn until to-morrow so as not to have to change the agenda for next week.

The meeting stands adjourned until to-morrow.

The meeting adjourned at 1.05 p.m. to meet again Friday, June 27, 1947 at 11.00 a.m.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-115
www.nikkeimuseum.org

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-116
www.nikkeimuseum.org

APPENDIX "A"

(See also pp. 163-175, minutes of proceedings and evidence, May 13, 1947)

File No.	J. L.	Name	Appraisal	Sale Price	VLA File	Sold for by VLA	Remarks
			$ cts.	$ cts.		$ cts.	
2862	92	Adachi, A.	988 00	970 00	BC/218-P		
5058	93	Adachi, M. K.	1,222 00	1,222 00	BC/219-P		
5442	178	Amemori, A.	855 00	839 00	BC/1880-A	839 00	
5432	85	Araki, T.	850 00	834 00	BC/221-P		
9363	110	Endo, H.	419 00	411 00	BC/222-P		
9363/4	111	Endo, T. and H.	2,038 00	2,001 00	BC/223-P		
2864	116	Fukami, K.	1,400 00	1,374 00	BC/224-P		
2864	116	Fukami, K.	225 00	221 00			
2851	172	Fukami, K. M.	424 00	416 00	BC/225-P		
11060	75	Fukawa, S.	1,158 00	1,137 00	BC/226-P		
5573	31	Fujino, K.	2,085 00	2,047 00	BC/640-P		
5573	31	Fujino, K.	125 00	123 00			
Int. 132	87	Hirai, S.	323 00	317 00	BC/684-P		Cancelled—Title not obtained.
2853	89	Hashimoto, R.	1,560 00	1,532 00	BC/230-P		
4999	82	Hayashi, G.	550 00	540 00	BC/231-P		
6620	33	Hayashi, K.	977 00	959 00	BC/232-P		
5438	143	Hashizume, E.	570 00	560 00	BC/233-P		
5438	143	Hashizume, E.	2,326 00	2,284 00	BC/234-P	5,500 00	Westminster Priory Ltd.
5438	143	Hashizume, E.	120 00	118 00	BC/235-P		
5438	143	Hashizume, E.	1,795 00	1,763 00	BC/236-P		
4965	18	Hinatsu, Y.	1,488 00	1,461 00	BC/237-P		
4461	46	Hisaoka, I.	250 00	245 00	BC/1071-A	245 00	
4461	46	Hisaoka, I.	1,351 00	1,327 00	BC/1071-A	1,327 00	
5437	94	Ikebuchi, T.	1,450 00	1,424 00	BC/239-P	926 00	1 part sold, 1 part remaining (BC/2701-B).
5444	50	Inouye, Y.	755 00	741 90	BC/662-P		
6622	146	Ito, D.	2,100 00	1,964 00	BC/739-P.		To be cancelled—price too high.
4612	84	Kadoyama, I.	770 00	756 00	BC/242-P		
13862	171	Kadonaga, T.	731 00	718 00	BC/2158-B	718 00	
9937	112	Kamimura, K.	279 00	274 00	BC/244-P		
2859	117	Kato, K.	887 00	871 00	BC/663-P		
5439	19	Kitagawa, Y.	850 00	835 00			Withdrawn—offer deficient.
5440	27	Konno, Y.	769 00	755 00	BC/247-P		
5440	27	Konno, Y.	214 00	210 00	BC/247-P		
5574	118	Nagata, F.	500 00	491 00	BC/1071-A	491 00	
6018	118	Kudo, M.	668 00	656 00	BC/249-P		
5424	141	Kunimoto, S.	623 00	612 00	BC/250-P		
5424	141	Kunimoto, S.	1,835 00	1,802 00	BC/2593-B	535 55	Land only—house destroyed by fire.
2825	20	Mitsunaga, T.	610 00	599 00	BC/252-P		
2861	32	Morihama, T.	280 00	275 00	BC/253-P		
5441	32	Miyagawa, H.					
5428	24	Miyagawa, T.	1,000 00	982 00	BC/2084-B	982 00	
4741	107	Mori, Y.	2,179 00	2,140 00	BC/664-P		
4742	108	Mori, Y.	512 00	503 00	BC/256-P		
2861	17	Moriyama, T.	500 00	491 00	BC/257-P		
12875	17	Moriyama, M.	809 00	874 00	BC/2458-B	874 00	
2861	17	Moriyama, T.	79 00	78 00	BC/1017-P		
15607	120	Nakamura, H.	1,300 00	1,276 00	BC/259-P		Cancelled—title not obtained.
5419	408	Nakashima, T.	820 00	805 00	BC/1423-A	805 00	
2865	2	Nishiyama, K.	2,386 00	2,343 00	BC/672-P		
5430	196	Nomura, Y.	1,216 00	1,194 00	BC/262-P		
2883	77	Ogawa, K.	970 00	952 00	BC/263-P		
1352	49	Oda, K.	1,265 00	1,242 00	BC/2518-A	1,242 00	
10220	3	Ohashi, S.	4,526 00	4,444 00	BC/265-P		
10220	3	Ohashi, S.	449 00	441 00	BC/266-P		
10220	3	Ohashi, S.	297 00	292 00	BC/267-P		
5435	90	Okabe, D.	2,100 00	2,062 00	BC/2134-B	2,062 00	
5435	90	Okabe, D.	96 00	94 00	BC/269-P		
5575	489	Okamura, M.	453 00	445 00			Cancelled, not suitable.
5445	1	Okuma, Y.	2,677 00	2,628 00	BC/271-P	2,628 00	(Sold in 2 parts) (BC/2304-B and BC/2482-B).
9332	113	Oniskaki, S.	328 00	322 00	BC/2088-B	322 00	
5443	45	Ohno, K.	974 00	956 00	BC/686-P		
9331	30	Saito, K.	1,600 00	1,571 00	BC/274-P		
2867	86	Saito, K.	1,000 00	982 00	BC/275-P		
2705		Mrs. Shizu Saito.					
12227	220	Sakon, B.	4,229 00	4,152 00	BC/233-A	4,152 00	
4601	80	Sakon, M.	1,796 00	1,764 00	BC/277-P		
4601	80	Sakon, M.	424 00	416 00	BC/278-P		
13382	91	Sakon, M.	514 00	505 00	BC/279-P		
13587		Sakon, I.					
4616	142	Sasaki, C.	763 00	749 00	BC/280-P	520 80	(1 part sold, 1 part remaining) (BC/2394-B).
5425	28	Sato, S.	715 00	702 00	BC/281-P		
5578	135	Senda, K.	1,775 00	1,743 00	BC/665-P	1,743 00	Sold in two parts, BC/2644-A and .25 acre pcl. to Farmers' Association of Mission for sum of $150.00. ($403.95 received from timber sales).
9336	23	Oikawa, M. N.	1,622 00	1,593 00	BC/1651-B	1,189 55	
2873	26	Shimomura, T.	1,190 00	1,168 00	BC/284-P		
3265	129	Shimoda, K.	775 00	761 00	BC/285-P		
5434		Uyemura, I.					
3265	76	Shimoda, K.	492 00	483 00	BC/286-P		
2525		Mitsunaga, T.					
Int. 1248	64	Shiono, N. (In Trust)	577 00	567 00	BC/287-P		
Int. 713	121	Shirakawa, T.	450 00	442 00	BC/288-P		Cancelled—title not obtained.
Int. 713	121	Shirakawa, T.	1,422 00	1,396 00	BC/289-P		Cancelled—title not obtained.
Int. 1111	34	Towomura, M.	600 00	589 00	BC/290-P		Subdivision—see appendix No. 2.
Int. 1111	48	Towomura, M.	539 00	529 00	BC/291-P		
13693	78	Tashiro, G.	1,600 00	1,571 00	BC/293-P		Cancelled—title not obtained.

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-117
www.nikkeimuseum.org

File No.	J. L.	Name	Appraisal	Sale Price	VLA File	Sold for by VLA	Remarks
			$ cts.	$ cts.		$ cts.	
2875	79	Tashiro, E.	499 00	490 00	BC/294-P		
5579	21	Tatebe, K.	1,100 00	1,080 00	BC/295-P		
Int. 5579	22	Tatebe, K.	760 00	746 00	BC/296-P		Subdivision—see Appendix 2.
Int. 1113	114	Tateyama, S.	565 00	555 00	BC/297-P		
5576	25	Tsuji, K.	800 00	1,188 60	BC/2401-B	1,188 60	
4962	51	Tsuji, T.	460 00	452 00			Withdrawn.
5581		Tsuji, S.					
9320	136	Umestu, K. (in trust)	1,861 00	1,827 00	BC/300-P		Subdivision—see Appendix 2.
5434	47	Uyemura, I.	260 00	255 00	BC/302-P		
5434	47	Uyemura, I.	1,325 00	1,301 00	BC/301-P		
3267	88	Watanabe, Y.	1,200 00	1,178 00	BC/303-P		Subdivision—see Appendix 2.
3267	88	Watanabe, Y.	235 00	231 00	BC/304-P		
2881	83	Yako, T.	360 00	353 00	BC/666-P		
5421	29	Yanoshita, T.	1,850 00	2,095 00	BC/742/P		
5421	29	Yanoshita, T.	555 00	545 00			Withdrawn.
Int. 736	181	Aoki, C.	195 00	191 00	BC/308-P		
5060	184	Aoki, K.	885 00	869 00	BC/309-P		
5060	184	Aoki, K.	188 00	185 00	BC/310-P		
2857	145	Hattori, S.	1,377 00	1,352 00	BC/311-P	1,425 00	(1 pcl.) Purchase price $1,425.00 (BC/349-B).
2855	145	Hattori, M.	110 00	108 00	BC/311-P		
5433	173	Hayashi, T.	793 00	779 00	BC/313-P		Purchase price $426.00, Custodian having recovered $353.00 insurance on house destroyed by fire.
6620	33	Hayashi, K.	368 00	361 00			Sold June, 1942.
5437	94	Ikebuchi, T.	615 00	604 00	BC/314-P		
1572	198	Ito, Y.	850 00	835 00	BC/315-P		
4529	169	Kimura, I.	1,420 00	1,394 00	BC/316-P		
2889	170	Kinoshita, A.	880 00	864 00	BC/317-P		
4963	119	Kodama, T.	880 00	864 00	BC/318-P		
4960	177	Matsushita, J.	91 00	89 00	BC/319-P		
5441	179	Miyagawa, H.	340 00	334 00	BC/320-P	334 00	Sold in 4 parts (BC/626-B, BC/2645-B, BC/2646-B and BC/2647-B).
5426	182	Nakashima, U.	2,190 00	2,150 00	BC/321-P		
2287	183	Okamura, S.	299 00	294 00	BC/322-P		
5445	1	Okuma, Y.	240 00	236 00	BC/323-P		
5425	174	Sato, S.	130 00	128 00	BC/324-P		
2871	144	Shigehiro, K.	1,151 00	1,130 00	BC/325-P		
5420	23	Shikaze, K.	1,875 00	1,841 00			Withdrawn.
5420	23	Shikaze, K.	552 00	542 00	BC/327-P		Subdivision—see Appendix 2.
13222	168	Takamoto, S.	225 00	221 00	BC/328-P		
2879	180	Yahiro, Kin	1,785 00	1,753 00	BC/329-P	1,465 00	Sold in 2 parts—Cost price $1,465.00 (BC/2432-B and BC/2581-B).

11525	7	Abe, M.	1,831 00	1,798 00	BC/5-P		
7008	217	Aonuma, I.	1,885 00	1,851 00	BC/6-P		
8654	53	Arinobu, H.	612 00	601 00			
5993	56	Arinobu, M.	1,593 00	1,564 00	BC/1552-B	1,564 00	Cancelled, title not obtained.
2763	164	Ariza, E.	1,509 00	1,482 00	BC/8-P		
5992		Ariza, M.					
12585	153	Fujii, Y.	1,218 00	1,196 00	BC/9-P	865 00	1 part sold, 1 part remaining (BC/2710-B).
5318		Fujita, H.					
5831	391	Nakano, R.	2,808 00	2,757 00	BC/196-A	2,757 00	
Int. 1263		Iwato, S.					
5284		Otani, K.	729 00	716 00	BC/1909-B	716 00	
6399	188	Otani, Y.					
2761	195	Fujita, Y.	1,094 00	1,074 00	BC/12-P		
5069	374	Fujino, S.	1,537 00	1,509 00	BC/1240-A	1,509 00	
5401	63	Fujishige, T.	1,155 00	1,134 00			
3368	349	Fujiwara, T.	264 00	259 00	BC/14-P		Sold prior to evacuation.
7348	13	Fukuda, T.	1,000 00	982 00	BC/15-P		
3325	375	Fukunaga, S.	25 00	25 00	BC/16-P		Cancelled, title not obtained.
Int. 131	148	Furuya, M. and Co. Ltd.	521 00	512 00	BC/17-P		Cancelled, title not obtained.
5431	6	Furukawa, G.	1,400 00	1,375 00	BC/2498-A	1,375 00	Cancelled, title not obtained.
5431	6	Furukawa, G.	731 00	718 00	BC/2211-B	718 00	
7346	12	Furukawa, K.	1,700 00	1,669 00	BC/1348-A	1,669 00	
4230	98	Furuse, K.	170 00	167 00	BC/21-P		
2281	313	Go, T.	257 00	252 00	BC/22-P		
4820	321	Goryo, Y.	531 00	522 00	BC/23-P		Cancelled—title not obtained.
2860	16	Goto, G.	654 00	642 00	BC/24-P		
7376	61	Gyotoku, U.	1,127 00	1,106 00	BC/25-P		
6930	151	Hamaura, S.	47 00	46 00			Subdivision, see appendix No. 8.
6930	151	Hamaura, S.	96 00	94 00	BC/26-P	3,050 00	These lots sold by public tender together with J.L. 147 to William Minty for $3,050.00.
6930	151	Hamaura, S.	202 00	198 00			
Int. 564	128	Hara, K.	836 00	821 00			Sold May 1942.
6659	106	Hayami, M.	1,147 00	1,126 00	BC/2150-B	1,126 00	
9374	156	Hidaka, T.	292 00	287 00	BC/28-P		
767		Hidaka, K.					
4620	288	Hiramatsu, T.	203 00	199 00	BC/29-P		
7000	213	Hirowatari, H.	1,680 00	1,650 00	BC/1551-B	1,650 00	Only 1 property.
7001		Hirowatari, T.	1,680 00	1,650 00			
4833	211	Hisanaga, M.	924 00	907 00	BC/2420-B	907 00	
4846	192	Hisanaga, M.	150 00	147 00	NC/32-P		
Int. 162	361	Hori, G.	350 00	344 00	BC/1267-B	344 00	
8794		Hori, S.					
8662	150	Horiuchi, Y.	878 00	862 00	BC/1648-B	862 00	
5403	105	Hosaki, S.	3,170 00	3,113 00	BC/35-P		Subdivision—see appendix 5.
5403	137	Hosaki, S.	285 00	280 00	BC/36-P		
5403	137	Hosaki, S.	744 00	731 00	BC/2262-B	731 00	
Int. 7352		Hoyano, T.					
Int. 1437	54	Yamasaki, K.	940 00	923 00	BC/2190-B	923 00	
1302		Okasakil, L.					

JL 147 = 95.00
$333. - $3050.

UNIVERSITY
OF ALBERTA LIBRARY

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-118
www.nikkeimuseum.org

File No.	J. L.	Name	Appraisal	Sale Price	VLA File	Sold for by VLA	Remarks
			$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	
7353	682	Hoyaho (Mrs.) Y.	3,635 00	3,569 00	BC/2196-A	3,569 00	
Int. 402	683	Ichikawa, H.	2,760 00	2,710 00	BC/2052-A	2,710 00	
6988	314	Ikeda, K.	1,986 00	1,950 00	BC/1733-B	1,950 00	
6996	216	Imada, K.	3,038 00	2,983 00	BC/2360-A	916 78	Fire loss recovery $2,066.22.
6933		Imada, T.					
6929	345	Imada, K.	392 00	385 00	BC/42-P		
7378		Imada, T.					
6995	254	Imada, Y.	1,350 00	1,326 00	BC/2698-A	1,326 00	
8823	366	Iinuma, T.	252 00	248 00	BC/771-B	248 00	J. L. 354 also sold—same account.
9379	390	Inouye, Y.	Nil	Nil			
6990	309	Isoshima, T.	866 00	850 00	BC/45-P		
6983	310	Isoshima, Y.	2,269 00	2,228 00	BC/1370-A	2,228 00	
3413	376	Itaya, W.	501 00	492 00	BC/47-P		
736	358	Iwamoto, T.	366 00	359 00	BC/48-P		
3415	359	Iwamoto, S.	771 00	757 00	BC/49-P		
7349	35	Iwase, T.	1,305 90	1,281 00	BC/2636-B	1,256 00	Fire loss recovery $25.00.
8059	389	Kajuira, H.	1,660 00	1,630 00	BC/1592-B	1,630 00	
13606		Kajuira, D.					
12273	684	Kanzaki, T.	3,728 00	3,661 00	BC/52-P		
8791	342	Kato, K.	49 00	48 00	BC/53-P		
14172		Sato, S.					
8796	353	Kato. S.	552 00	542 00	BC/2670-B	542 00	
8667	149	Katsuno, C.	1,870 00	1,836 00	BC/2053-B	1,836 00	
5281	187	Kawashima, A.	627 00	616 00	BC/2317-B	616 00	
7342	194	Kawamoto, M.	270 00	265 00	BC/57-P		
8670	68	Kawamoto, S.	1,770 00	1,738 00	BC/58-P		Subdivision—see appendix 5.
9386	154	Kido, K.	1,000 00	982 00	BC/1425-C	982 00	
4981	127	Kido, S.	1,196 00	1,174 00	BC/2356-B	1,174 00	
11970	138	Kiku, T.	504 00	495 00			Sold by Official Administrator.
8790	350	Kobayashi, K.	281 00	276 00	BC/61-P		
2759	175	Koga, S.	1,516 00	1,489 90	BC/2051-B	1,489 00	Purchased price, $1,489.00.
2885	166	Koga, T.	1,434 00	1,408 00	BC/2634-B	1,408 00	
8272	246	Kobara, C.	684 00	672 00	BC/64-P		
8308	279	Kohy, T., Mrs.	1,558 00	1,530 00	BC/251-B	1,530 00	
8673		Kohy, Y.					
5283	263	Kojima, I.	1,571 00	1,543 00	BC/2165-B	1,543 00	
6981		Kosaka, J.					
6980	176	Kosaka, T.	3,145 00	3,088 00	BC/67-P		VLA records show the J.L. No. to be 685.
6982		Kosaka, M.					
3425	348	Kosaka, K.	496 00	487 00	BC/702-B	487 00	
2924		Kosaka, M.					
6987	176	Kosaka, M.	418 00	410 00	BC/69-P		
6987		Kosaka, K.					
7362	73	Kumamoto, H.	1,482 00	1,455 00	BC/70-P		Subdivision—see Appendix 1.
9351		Kumamoto, T.					
7361	74	Kumamoto, K.	701 00	688 00	BC/71-P		Subdivision—see Appendix 1.
7360		Kumamoto, T.					
9587	55	Kusano, K.	430 00	422 00	BC/72-P		
9587	55	Kusano, K.	2,241 00	2,200 00			
9588	161	Maehara, K.	500 00	491 00	BC/2027-A	491 00	Sold June, 1943.
4652	162	Maehara, M.	1,110 00	1,090 00	BC/2027-A	1,090 00	
7004	287	Makino, M.	1,300 00	1,276 00	BC/75-P		
5282	285	Matsume, T.	1,100 00	1,080 00	BC/76-P		Fire loss recovery $738.75.
2001	199	Matsuo, K.	755 00	741 00	BC/2147-B	736 00	
2633		Matsuo, S.					Fire loss recovery $5.00.
8674	209	Matsuoka, T.	1,443 00	1,417 00	BC/298-B	1,417 00	
8677	686	Miyasaki, M.	3,345 00	3,284 00	BC/1378-A	3,284 00	
5285	261	Matsunie, I.	484 00	475 00	BC/80-P		
*5402	284	Matsumoto, Y.	419 00	411 00	BC/81-P		
7350	36	Mende, S.	131 00	129 00	BC/2558-B	129 00	
3445	346	Miki, Y.	939 00	922 00	BC/2318-B	922 00	
4836	270	Mishima, T.	1,000 00	982 00	BC/84-P	452 00	1 part sold, 1 part remaining (BC/2526-B).
4831	264	Miyake, T.	402 00	395 00	BC/85-P		
4830		Miyake, N.					
2757	210	Mitani, H.	997 00	979 00	BC/86-P		
3401	320	Miyanaga, Y.	765 00	751 00	BC/87-P		
3403		Miyanaga, Mrs. K.					
8797	130	Morishige, F.	503 00	494 00	BC/88-P		
3360	130	Nishikawa, S.	722 00	709 00	BC/89-P		
6986	290	Mochizuki, N.	2,258 00	2,217 00	BC/2452-A	2,217 00	
6984	286	Mochizuki, S.	2,074 00	2,036 00	BC/2621-B	2,036 00	
7366	248	Morikawa, K.	3,156 00	3,099 00	BC/92-P		
8680	193	Morikawa, M.	1,577 00	1,548 00	BC/93-P		Subdivision—see appendix 1.
8682		Morikawa, F.					
7351	42	Mukai, O.	2,384 00	2,341 00	BC/1007-B	2,341 00	
7351	42	Mukai, O.	590 00	579 00	BC/95-P		Sudbivision—see appendix 8.
3409	354	Mukaia, K.	2,558 00	2,512 00	BC/771-B	2,512 00	J.L. 366 also sold—same account.
7375	71	Mukuda, N.	894 00	878 00			Sold by Custodian prior to June/42.
Int. 201	363	Nabeta, M.	212 00	208 00	BC/98-P		
4796	157	Nabuto, F. Mrs.	466 00	458 00			Sold by Custodian July /42.
4832		Nabuto, K.					
6977	307	Yoshihara, I.	1,000 00	982 00	BC/2374-B	982 00	
6972		Yoshihara, R.					
12001	256	Nagao, M.	1,728 00	1,697 00	BC/100-P		
7354	69	Nakahara, H.	2,405 00	2,362 00	BC/101-P		
6928	322	Nakamuar, M.	2,187 00	2,147 00	BC/2554-A	2,147 00	Subdivision—see appendix 5.
13467		Nakamura, H.					
7367	66	Nakano, A.	1,000 00	982 00	BC/1682-B	982 00	
7368	122	Nakano, A.	818 00	803 00	BC/104-P		
5975	43	Nakano, J.	2,913 00	2,560 00	BC/661-A	2,860 00	Subdivision—see appendix 1.
5974	43	Nakano, J.	Included above	300 00			

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-119
www.nikkeimuseum.org

File No.	J. L.	Name	Appraisal	Sale Price	VLA File	Sold for by VLA	Remarks
			$ cts.	$ cts.		$ cts.	
7377	57	Nakano, S.	770 00	756 00	BC/106-P	.....	
7364	67	Nakano, Y.	1,249 00	1,226 00	BC/1170-B	1,226 00	
7373	41	Nakata, Y.	572 00	562 00	BC/108-P	.....	
10457 / 13949	281	Namba, A. / Namba, S.	2,482 00	2,437 00	BC/1593-A	2,437 00	
1927	274	Namba, M.	207 00	203 00	BC/2671-B	203 00	
5821	343	Nikaido, M.	644 00	632 00	BC/111-P	.....	
8047	352	Natsuyara, K.	2,363 00	2,320 00	BC/112-P	.....	
3955	65	Nishimoto, K.	250 00	246 00	BC/113-P	.....	
2839 / 2843	247	Odaguchi, F. / Odaguchi, E.	598 00	587 00	BC/217-A	587 00	J.L. 212 also sold same account.
8685	318	Odamura, T.	2,955 00	2,902 00	BC/303-A	2,902 00	
8689	277	Odamura, T.	47 00	46 00	BC/116-P	.....	
8687 / 8688	317	Odamura, T. / Odamura, N.	304 00	299 00	BC/117-P	.....	
5230	367	Ogawa, S.	53 00	52 00	BC/118-P	.....	
8802	341	Ogawa, R.	1,343 00	1,319 00	BC/2386-B	1,319 00	
5972 / 8676	308	Ohta, Y. / Miyamota, S.	1,050 00	1,031 00	BC/120-P	.....	
8695	39	Oike, K.	3,454 00	3,392 00	BC/121-P	.....	Subdivision—see Appendix No. 6.
4837	242	Oka, S.	1,300 00	1,276 00	BC/1881-B	1,276 00	
4838 / 4841	283	Oka, T. / Oka, M.	1,900 00	1,866 00	BC/1543-A	1,866 00	
5003	11	Okabe, K.	1,139 00	1,118 00	BC/1911-B	1,118 00	
8692 / 8666	305	Okada, T. / Karatsu, N.	1,051 00	1,032 00	BC/125-P	.....	
4222	95	Okahashi, M.	133 00	131 00	BC/126-P	.....	Cancelled—title not obtained.
2837	186	Okano, K.	2,404 00	2,360 00	BC/2282-A	2,360 00	J.L. 163 also sold same account.
5278	255	Okano, M.	210 00	206 00	BC/128-P	.....	
6974 / 6970	243	Oki, H. / Oki, T.	1,579 00	1,551 00	BC/129-P	.....	
6970	219	Oki, T.	48 00	47 00	BC/130-P	.....	
4980	357	Okubo, F.	947 00	930 00	BC/131-P	.....	
8699	4	Omura, S.	600 00	589 00	BC/132-P	.....	
8698	5	Omura, S.	3,010 00	2,955 00	BC/133-P	.....	
2835	163	Onagi, K.	750 00	736 00	BC/2282-A	736 00	J.L. 186 also sold, same account.
9214	115	Mori, H. Mrs.	330 00	324 00	BC/135-P	.....	
2543	212	Osato, S.	1,812 00	1,779 00	BC/217-A	1,779 00	J.J. 247 also sold, same account.
4835	100	Ozamoto, M.	995 00	977 00	BC/137-P	.....	
6991	316	Ryoji, K.	1,504 00	1,380 00	BC/1491-B	1,380 00	
10105	103	Sakaki, T.	100 00	98 00	BC/139-P	.....	
7359	59	Sakamoto, M.	268 00	263 00	BC/140-P	.....	
7374	58	Sano, S.	2,145 00	2,108 00	BC/141-P	.....	

3419	460	Sawada, T.	986 00	968 00	BC/142-P	.....	
7369	10	Sawayama, G.	847 00	832 00	BC/143-P	.....	
Int. 879	304	Seko, S.	1,324 00	1,300 00	BC/2542-B	1,300 00	
6989	214	Seo, M.	363 00	356 00	BC/145-P	.....	
2887	38	Seto, M.	1,415 00	1,389 00	BC/488-B	1,389 00	
3870	362	Shigemi, T.	901 00	885 00	BC/147-P	.....	
2797	159	Shimizu, J.	2,028 00	1,991 00	BC/148-P	.....	
11297	129	Shimoda, K.	507 00	498 00	BC/149-P	.....	Cancelled—title not obtained.
8815	351	Shimizu, R.	276 00	271 00	BC/150-P	.....	
8703	258	Shimoji, S.	918 00	901 00	BC/151-P	.....	
9327	276	Shimoji, K.	900 00	884 00	BC/152-P	.....	
9401	123	Shin, S. Z.	1,861 00	1,827 00	BC/2058-A	1,593 16	Purchase price $1,600., sale of stumpage $6.84, J.L. 132 also sold, same account.
9402	311	Shin, Y.	752 00	738 00	BC/154-P	.....	
6993	282	Shishido, E.	1,000 00	982 00	BC/155-P	.....	
3417	360	Shono, K.	699 00	686 00	BC/2110-B	686 00	
12276	365	Shoji, G. Y.	1,305 00	1,404 28	BC/157-P	.....	
Int. 1347	147	Sunada, T.	96 00	95 00	BC/158-P	3,050 00	This lot sold by public tender together with J.L. 151 to William Minty.
6161 / 8706	280	Tada, G. / Tada, T.	505 00	496 00	BC/159-P	.....	
5453	378	Tahara, R.	1,260 00	1,237 00	BC/269-B	1,237 00	
1496	415	Tahara, T.	102 00	100 00	BC/161-P	.....	
11617	185	Takagi, D.	525 00	516 00	BC/162-P	.....	
4971	40	Takahash	1,116 00	1,180 00	BC/163-P	.....	
8710	275	Takasaki, S.	1,200 00	1,178 00	BC/372-B	1,178 00	
8710	275	Takasaki, S.	260 00	255 00	BC/164-P	.....	
7357	15	Takashima, T.	1,300 00	1,277 00	BC/1589-B	1,277 00	
8003	60	Takashima, Y.	240 00	236 00	BC/2568-B	236 00	
6409	70	Takashita, T.	2,184 00	2,145 00	BC/168-P	.....	Subdivision—see Appendix No. 6.
9612	134	Takeuchi, M.	468 00	460 00	BC/169-P	.....	
9410	133	Takeuchi, Y.	833 00	818 00	BC/170-P	.....	
9405	155	Takiguchi, H. (Mrs.)	495 00	486 00	BC/171-P	.....	
9405	126	Takiguchi, H.	179 00	176 00	BC/172-P	.....	
8714	101	Takimoto, Y.	Nil	Nil			
6661	158	Kakumasu, S.	274 00	269 00	BC/173-P	.....	
6968	215	Tamura, J.	2,161 00	2,122 00	BC/1996-A	2,122 00	
5280 / 5316	224	Tamura, M. / Tamura, Y.	2,130 00	2,091 00	BC/175-P	.....	
5279 / 5286	72	Tamura, M. / Tamura, T.	676 00	664 00	BC/1-P	.....	Subdivision—see Appendix 1.
4840	273	Tanaka, S.	750 00	736 00	BC/176-P	.....	
4840	273	Tanaka, S.	522 00	513 00		.....	Title not obtained.
4840	273	Tanaka, S.	1,797 00	1,765 00	BC/525-B	1,765 00	
4844	272	Tanaka, Y.	1,125 00	1,105 00	BC/2359-B	1,105 00	
4845	271	Tanaka, M.	196 00	192 00	BC/179-P	.....	
5287	262	Taniguchi, R.	2,572 00	2,525 00	BC/745-A	2,619 00	
5287	262	Taniguchi, R.	96 00	94 00			
6978	241	Tateishie, T.	295 00	290 00	BC/181-P	.....	

OF ALBERTA LIBRARY

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-120
www.nikkeimuseum.org

File No.	J. L.	Name	Appraisal	Sale Price	VLA File	Sold for by VLA	Remarks
			$ cts.	$ cts.		$ cts.	
5958	52	Tazumi, A.	1,200 00	1,178 00	BC/182-P	.....	Subdivision—see Appendix 8.
5958	52	Tazumi, A.	175 00	172 00	BC/183-P	.....	
2925	379	Tokuyasu, Y.	388 00	381 00	BC/184-P	.....	
4220	102	Teramura, N.	920 00	913 00	BC/185-P	.....	
2852	152	Tomita, M.	1,012 00	994 00	BC/4-P	.....	
3399 / 3411	131	Ikeda, Y. / Tsujita, T.	488 00	479 00	BC/2623-B	479 00	
3411	344	Tsujita, T.	605 00	594 00	BC/187-P	.....	
13554	37	Tsujiura, T.	336 00	330 00	BC/188-P	.....	Cancelled, title not obtained.
9321	160	Tusuyuki, I.	434 00	426 00	BC/189-P	.....	
9321	132	Uchimaru, I.	1,219 00	1,197 00	BC/2058-A	1,197 00	J. L. 123 also sold, same account.
4821	323	Uchimaru, K.	174 00	171 00	BC/191-P	.....	
9416 / Int. 1414	347	Umetsu, K. / Umetsu, T.	1,088 00	1,068 00	BC/192-P	.....	Purchase being cancelled.
4842	189	Ura, I.	1,265 00	1,242 00	BC/1918-B	1,242 00	
4839	206	Utsonomiya, G.	1,750 00	1,718 00	BC/194-P	.....	
Int. 366	124	Uyeno, H.	563 00	553 00	BC/195-P	.....	
3366	380	Wada, K.	293 00	288 00	BC/196-P	.....	
4823	392	Wakahara, S.	1,580 00	1,551 00	BC/197-P	.....	
13057	97	Wakayama, K.	2,726 00	2,677 00	BC/198-P	.....	
5451	364	Yakashiro, T.	1,514 00	1,487 00	BC/199-P	.....	
5451 / 3405	356	Yakashiro, T. / Taniguchi, K.	1,222 00	1,200 00	BC/200-P	.....	
6660	253	Yamaga, Y.	1,614 00	1,585 00	BC/2597-B	1,585 00	
7371	44	Yamamoto, K.	50 00	49 00	BC/202-P	.....	
7371	44	Yamamoto, K.	50 00	49 00	BC/202-P	.....	
7370	62	Yamamoto, R.	1,416 00	1,390 00	BC/1912-B	1,390 00	
11243	207	Yamamoto, T. now Taku, T.	685 00	673 00	BC/204-P	.....	
8716	278	Yamamoto, U.	2,080 00	2,042 00	BC/2316-B	2,042 00	
8717	139	Yamasaki, N.	590 00	579 00	BC/206-P	.....	
6992 / 12228	315	Yamasaki, G. / Yoshizaki, Y.	738 00	725 00	BC/207-P	.....	
6663 / 6664	165	Yokoyama, A. / Yokoyama, T.	1,028 00	1,009 00	BC/208-P	.....	
6662	218	Yokoyama, T.	775 00	741 00	BC/209-P	.....	
6976	291	Yoneyma, R.	1,420 00	1,394 00	BC/210-P	.....	
8719	312	Yoshida, G.	978 00	960 00	BC/211-P	.....	
8721	208	Yoshida, M.	2,765 00	2,715 00	BC/1272-A	2,715 00	
5288	190	Yoshida, Y.	1,681 00	1,651 00	BC/1939-B	1,651 00	
6975	104	Yoshida, E.	1,925 00	1,890 00	BC/2163-A	1,890 00	
6972	691	Yoshihara, R.	3,689 00	3,622 00	BC/215-P	.....	
7383	99	Yoshikawa, S.	1,550 00	1,522 00	BC/1544-B	1,522 00	
Int. 1357	257	Yoshino, K.	1,705 00	1,674 00	BC/2047-B	1,674 00	
10660	9	Yoshioka, A.	1,822 00	1,789 00	BC/165-P.	.....	
7373	8	Yoshioka, K.	1,376 00	1,351 00	BC/97-P	.....	
376	231	Aratake, S.	943 00	926 00	BC/353-P	.....	
5995	228	Adachi, Y.	431 00	423 00	BC/2264-A	423 00	
5994	205	Amano, S.	475 00	466 00	BC/2529-B	466 00	
9364	109	Endo, T.	1,081 00	1,061 00	BC/356-P	.....	
3941	244	Eto, S.	2,887 00	2,835 00	BC/357-P	.....	Subdivision—see Appendix No. 9.
5089	227	Fugikawa, S.	1,255 00	1,232 00	BC/358-P	.....	
5990	202	Fugikawa, G.	980 00	962 00	BC/2267-B	962 00	
6685	266	Handa, M.	78 00	76 00	BC/360-P	.....	
5988	743	Haraga, M.	1,246 00	1,223 00	BC/361-P	.....	
4965	18	Hinatsu, Y.	870 00	854 00	BC/362-P	.....	
5977	191	Morizaki, F.	1,604 00	1,663 00	BC/363-P	.....	
13930	678	Imamura, K.	1,009 00	991 00	BC/364-P	.....	Subdivision—see Appendix No. 4.
13930	678	Imamura, K.	1,649 00	1,619 00	BC/215-A	.....	Subdivision—see Appendix No. 4.
4988	295	Imamura, K.	389 00	382 00	BC/365-P	.....	
4498	293	Inouye, S.	840 00	825 00	BC/366-P	.....	
4018	112	Kamimura, K.	1,379 00	1,354 00	BC/367-P	.....	V.L.A. records this as L.J. 197.
4528	301	Katsura, S.	1,251 00	1,228 00	BC/368-P	.....	
5983	340	Kawana, K.	2,094 00	2,056 00	BC/2048-A	2,056 00	
Int. 305	234	Kinoshita, M.	485 00	476 00	BC/370-P	.....	
4619	200	Kodama, S.	2,114 00	2,076 00	BC/371-P	.....	
13387	265	Kunimoto, S.	1,639 00	1,609 00	BC/660-P	.....	
5981	245	Kusano, A.	1,653 00	1,623 00	BC/372-P	.....	Subdivision—see Appendix No. 9.
8652 / 3961	252	Maruyama, S. / Maruyama, S.	726 00	713 00	BC/373-P	.....	
5430	269	Masuda, S.	797 00	783 00	BC/661-P	.....	
5979	221	Matsui, I.	1,385 00	1,360 00	BC/374-P	1,061 40	1 part sold, 1 part remaining (BC/2441-B).
6624	203	Matsumoto, S.	340 00	334 00	BC/736-P	.....	
8675	238	Matsuoka, H.	738 00	725 00	BC/375-P	.....	
4524	679	Miki, M.	2,555 00	2,509 00	BC/376-P	.....	
3945	251	Mimura, T. J.	666 00	644 00	BC/377-P	.....	
4506	225	Miyasaki, S.	2,255 00	2,214 00	BC/2152-A	2,189 00	0·888 acres sold to Munic. of Matsqui for $25.00.
7366	248	Morikawa, K.	998 00	980 00	BC/379-P	.....	
4990	294	Morikawa, T.	1,007 00	989 00	BC/380-P	.....	
5076	233	Murakami, H.	450 00	442 00	BC/381-P	.....	
3957	298	Nakamura, S.	1,250 00	1,227 00	BC/382-P	.....	
3955	65	Nishimoto, K.	2,942 00	2,889 00	BC/383-P	.....	
4512	267	Noda, G.	192 00	189 00		.....	Title not obtained.
4512	267	Noda, G.	1,075 00	1,055 00	BC/2151-A	1,055 00	
4496 / Int. 1268	237	Ogata, K. / Nakagawa, G.	2,224 00	2,184 00	BC/385-P	.....	Cancelled, title not obtained,
4226	239	Oka, U. (Mrs.)	488 00	479 00	BC/386-P	.....	
7832	250	Orida, I.	620 00	609 00	BC/387-P	.....	
3949	249	Orida, M.	663 00	651 00	BC/388-P	.....	
4991	300	Oye, C.	2,100 00	2,062 00	BC/343-A	2,062 00	

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-121
www.nikkeimuseum.org

File No.	J. L.	Name	Appraisal	Sale Price	VLA File	Sold for by VLA	Remarks
			$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	
9310	209	Saito, T.	792 00	778 00	BC/390-P		
5577	222	Sameshima, M.	1,892 00	1,858 00	BC/391-P		
5964	223	Sasaki, R.	3,278 00	3,219 00	BC/392-P		
7038	174	Sato, S.	1,555 00	1,527 00	BC/393-P		
5184	204	Shikaze, Y.	390 00	382 00	BC/394-P		
5436	204	Shikaze, Y.	292 00	287 00	BC/394-P		
Int. 713	121	Shirakawa, T.	1,826 00	1,793 00	BC/395-P		Cancelled, title not obtained.
4602		Inaba, M.					
5961	230	Sugiyama, K.	1,849 00	1,816 00	BC/396-P		
4653	302	Tabara, S.	726 00	713 00	BC/397-P		
4500	303	Taise, H.	812 00	797 00			Foreclosed.
5531	292	Tajiri, K.	475 00	466 00	BC/398-P		
8708	201	Takake, K.	610 00	600 00	BC/399-P		
7040	324	Tanaka, T.	456 00	448 00	BC/400-P		
4504	319	Taniyama, S.	921 00	940 00	BC/401-P		
14885		Tateishi, I. (Dec'd)					
3941	226	Eto, S.	672 00	660 00			Withdrawn—died prior to 26/2/42.
5000		Okabe, T.					
13386	259	Tsutsumi, H.	2,067 00	2,030 00	BC/402-P		
4502	299	Tsutsumi, M.	1,266 00	1,204 00	BC/403-P		
14041	296	Yamada, S.	2,370 00	2,327 00	BC/404-P		Subdivision—see Appendix No. 4.
13385	240	Yamamoto, I.	1,340 00	1,316 00	BC/405-P		
5044	268	Yamamoto, K.	800 00	785 00	BC/2567-A	785 00	
13142	235	Yamamoto, S.	1,795 60	1,762 00	BC/2468-A	1,762 00	
5582	232	Yanoshita, S.	470 00	461 00	BC/2596-B	461 00	
5953	229	Yasumatsu, K.	2,453 00	2,409 00	BC/409-P		
Int. 725	297	Yosemitsu, K. (in U.S.A.)	1,555 00	1,527 00	BC/410-P		
3965	371	Abo, K.	735 00	722 00	BC/283-P		
8052	333	Akaye, K.	161 00	158 00	BC/298-P		Cancelled, title not obtained.
3333	335	Chiba, K.	245 00	241 00	BC/299-P		
8653	394	Eto, B.	1,136 00	1,115 00	BC/2674-C	1,115 00	
3967	370	Eto, K.	1,732 00	1,701 00	BC/2598-A	1,701 00	
3967	370	Eto, K.	453 00	455 00	BC/2598-A	455 00	
6642	332	Fujimoto, M.	1,659 00	1,629 00	BC/1440-A	1,629 00	
Int. 1276	336	Ishikawa, J.	200 00	196 00	BC/469-C	196 00	
7384		Ishikawa, I.					
8646	327	Kinoshita, S.	1,483 00	1,456 00	BC/331-P		
3023	328	Fukomoto, K.	1,290 00	1,267 00	BC/2065-A	1,267 00	
10225	330	Kamachi, O.	1,000 00	982 00	BC/333-P		
3959	334	Kinoshita, K.	1,263 00	1,240 00	BC/2312-B	1,240 00	
3959	334	Kinoshita, K.	50 00	49 00	BC/2312-B		Cancelled, title not obtained.
13004	326	Kinoshita, K.	465 00	456 00	BC/335-P		

13004	326	Kinoshita, K.	110 00	108 00	BC/335-P		
3921	676	Kitagawa, M.	2,080 00	2,042 00	BC/2387-A	2,042 00	
9053	744	Masuhara, A.	1,303 00	1,041 00			Sold, July, 1942.
8650	381	Mochizuki, T.	560 00	559 00	BC/541-B	559 00	
11544	373	Morishita, N.	2,654 00	2,606 00	BC/289-A	2,606 00	
3119	339	Nagara, G.	182 00	179 00	BC/339-P		
8648	406	Nako, H.	1,867 00	1,833 00	BC/554-A	1,833 00	
11519	329	Nishiguchi, M. Co. Ltd.	120 00	118 00			
11519	329	Nishiguchi, M. Co. Ltd.	660 00	648 00	BC/341-P		Cancelled, title not obtained.
11519	329	Nishiguchi, M. Co. Ltd.	1,023 00	1,005 00			
3963	372	Nitta, M.	1,481 00	1,454 00	BC/342-P		
Int. 1377	337	Oseki, N.	300 00	295 00	BC/343-P		
1656	338	Oshiro, E.	174 00	171 00	BC/2555-A	171 00	J. L. 368 also sold, same account.
8981	325	Ota, U.	496 00	487 00	BC/344-P		
9072	355	Oyama, S.	1,833 00	1,800 00	BC/1182-A	1,800 00	
8645	393	Sakamoto, Y.	750 00	736 00	BC/346-P		
11415	382	Shibata, C.	607 00	596 00	BC/1494-B	596 00	
3947	404	Shigehiro, O.	986 00	968 00	BC/422-A	968 00	
3943	369	Takaoka, H.	1,312 00	1,288 00	BC/350-B	1,288 00	
3953	368	Takeda, F.	2,242 00	2,201 00	BC/2555-A	2,201 00	J. L. 338 also sold, same account.
3953	368	Takeda, F.	1,173 00	1,152 00	BC/351-P		
3969	331	Yokoyama, M.	1,495 00	1,468 00	BC/1139-A	1,468 00	
7551	719	Asano, M.	111 00	109 00	BC/617-P		
8786	692	Fujino, B.	1,021 00	1,002 00	BC/618-P	1,002 00	Sold in two parts. (BC/2404-B and BC/2631-B).
5401	63	Fujishige, T.	546 00	536 00	BC/1701-A	536 00	
4939	587	Furutani, C.	1,915 00	1,880 00	BC/620-P		
8630	652	Goto, B.	589 00	578 00	BC/621-P		
Int. 1298	717	Goto, M.	56 00	55 00	BC/2167-A	55 00	J. L. 709 also sold, same account.
5612	588	Goto, T.	425 00	417 00	BC/473-P		
8644	650	Goto, Y.	23 00	23 00	BC/1375-B	1,620 90	P.I. Effected $58.90.
8644	650	Goto, Y.	1,567 00	1,539 00			
13566	718	Goto, Y.	598 00	587 00	BC/1603-B	587 00	
4891	553	Hamanishi, S.	121 00	119 00	BC/623-P		
Int. 959	641	Hashimoto, Y.	46 00	45 00	BC/624-P		
4928	434	Hikida, K.	3,284 00	3,225 00	BC/625-P		
5592	590	Ibuki, M.	2,411 00	2,367 00	BC/1641-A	2,367 00	
12519	591	Ikeda, T.	94 00	92 00	BC/626-P		
6897	646	Inaba, T.	1,910 00	1,875 00	BC/2251-B	1,875 00	
4942	673	Inaba, Y.	1,285 00	1,262 00	BC/1680-B	1,262 00	
4931	674	Kamada, T.	1,728 00	1,697 00	BC/2440-A	1,697 00	
7545	439	Katsumi, K.	56 00	55 00	BC/628-P		
8663	663	Kawata, T.	1,836 00	1,803 00	BC/2474-B	1,803 00	
13673	693	Koizumi, Y. (Dec'd)	1,720 00	1,689 00	BC/2449-A	2,340 00	Purchase price $2,500.00 sale of granary, for $160.00.
8643	716	Maruyama, T.	1,045 00	1,026 00	BC/2429-A	1,026 00	
6895	647	Miyazaki, S.	613 00	620 00	BC/2289-B	602 00	

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-122
www.nikkeimuseum.org

File No.	J. L.	Name	Appraisal	Sale Price	VLA File	Sold for by VLA	Remarks
			$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	
8621 6183	648	Mukai, Y. Mukai, K.	780 00	766 00	BC/2033-B	766 00	
5640	694	Naga, H.	1,380 00	1,355 00	BC/2035-A	1,355 00	
5591	665	Nagamori, M.	1,610 00	1,581 00	BC/2395-A	1,581 00	
5599	664	Nagasaka, K.	2,066 00	2,029 00	BC/442-P		
8051 7635 4588	593	Nishiyama, T. Nishiyama, M. Nishiyama, Y.	2,634 00	2,586 00	BC/1980-A	2,586 00	
8632	640	Note, K.	269 00	264 00	BC/1948-B	264 00	
4948	651	Oikawa, E.	240 00	236 00	BC/428-P		
5613	608	Oikawa, H.	183 00	180 00	BC/429-P		
3377	635	Oikawa, T.	144 00	141 00	BC/1366-B	141 00	J.L. 632 also sold, same account.
5590	715	Oikawa, U.	1,601 00	1,572 00	BC/671-B	1,572 00	
8629	666	Okabe, K.	1,963 00	1,927 00	BC/2111-A	1,927 00	
1654 5127	594	Onotera, H. Onotera, T.	626 00	615 00	BC/630-P		
8617	634	Otsuki, N.	5,533 00	5,433 00	BC/2410-A	5,433 00	
10352	595	Oyakawa, T.	2,845 00	2,793 00	BC/631-P		
8626	714	Sakai, S.	1,206 00	1,184 00	BC/1388-B	1,184 00	
5125	632	Sakurai, S.	190 00	187 00	BC/1366-B	187 00	J.L. 635 also sold, same account.
7544	606	Sakurai, S.	474 00	465 00	BC/601-P		
8631	596	Sano, N.	1,775 00	1,743 00	BC/330-P		
6896	631	Saruwatari, H.	1,241 00	1,219 00	BC/420-P	1,050 00	1 part sold, 1 part remaining (BC/2709-B)
8629	667	Sato, K.	2,337 00	2,295 00	BC/1962-A	2,295 00	
5598	607	Sasaki, K.	652 00	640 00	BC/452-P		
8638	695	Sato, M.	524 00	514 00	BC/1599-B	514 00	
8635	668	Shudo, S.	447 00	439 00			Withdrawn
Int. 190	712	Segawara, U.	47 00	46 00	BC/634-P		
4944	669	Sumioka, T.	926 00	909 00	BC/423-P	909 00	(Sold in 2 parts) (BC/2396-B and BC/2444-B). .
5607	552	Suzuki, G.	285 00	280 00	BC/455-P		
4945 4945 5602 5557	670 670 598 598	Suzuki, K. Suzuki, K. Suzuki, S. Suzuki, J.	1,394 90 384 00 418 00	1,369 00 377 00 410 00	BC/2496-A BC/414-P	1,746 00	
11409	633	Suzuki, T.	1,967 00	1,931 00	BC/275-B	1,931 00	
7540	713	Suzuki, G.	116 00	114 00	BC/635-P		
8625	599	Tagushi, K.	376 00	369 00	BC/2499-B	369 00	
4893	630	Takahashi, K.	242 00	238 00	BC/636-P		
8620	711	Takahashi, S.	791 00	777 00	BC/605-P	487 00	1 part sold, 1 part remaining (BC/2383-B)

8634	699	Takasu, H. Y.	981 00	666 00	BC/436-P		Subdivision—see Appendix No. 16.
8624	675	Takahashi, T.	1,012 00	995 00	BC/2078-B	955 00	
8621	674	Takayama, Y.	1,287 00	1,264 00	BC/603-P	1,264 00	Sold in 2 parts (BC/2131-B and (BC/2145-B).
5148	628	Takahashi, S.	948 00	931 00	BC/2049-B	931 00	
8636	710	Takenaka, S.	1,042 00	1,023 00	BC/2382-A	1,023 00	
9518	600	Tamaki, F.	2,057 00	2,020 00			
9518	600	Tamaki, F.	269 00	264 00	BC/616-P		
9518	600	Tamaki, F.	94 00	92 00			
8618	672	Uno, A.	1,908 00	1,970 00	BC/735-P	1,970 00	Sold in 2 parts (BC/1788-B and (BC/1955-B).
1718	629	Ura, T.	148 00	145 00	BC/637-P		
4926 4889	602	Wakai, S. Wakai, C.	1,786 00	1,754 00	BC/411-P		Subdivision—see Appendix No. 10.
5421	29	Yanoshita, T.	45 00	44 00	BC/638-P		
4928	709	Yukawa, Y.	1,011 00	993 00	BC/2167-A	993 00	J.L. 717 also sold, same account.
8642	554	Yukawa, Y.	1,380 00	1,355 00	BC/2103-B	1,355 00	
5606	402	Enta, T.	1,459 00	1,433 00	BC/2247-B	908 00	Fire loss recovery $525 00 ..
7531	437	Fujii, Y.	606 00	595 00	BC/515-P		
3839	445	Fujiki, H.	683 00	671 00			Withdrawn
13800	397	Fujinami, S.	42 00	41 00	BC/517-P	100 00	Sold to Kennedy Community Hall Association.
4929	568	Fukunaga, G.	455 00	437 00	BC/515-P		
6893	485	Fukushima, T.	1,112 00	1,092 00	BC/450-P	906 00	1 part sold, 1 part remaining (BC/2225-B).
7882	621	Hasebe, Y.	53 00	52 00			Cancelled—not suitable.
9831	435	Hashimoto, N.	222 00	218 00	BC/520-P		
10034	589	Higa, K.	2,115 00	2,077 00	BC/1238-B	2,077 00	
4938	434	Hikida, K.	1,476 00	1,449 00	BC/1879-A	1,449 00	
3841	477	Hirasawa, T.	2,421 00	2,377 00	BC/522-P	1,823 84	1 part sold, 1 part remaining (BC/2241-A).
4890	547	Hirose, A.	36 00	35 00	BC/523-P		
4940 4941	572	Hirose, T. Hirose, C.	621 00	610 00	BC/2582-B	610 00	
10036	906	Honda, G.	575 00	565 00	BC/525-P		Subdivision—see Appendix No. 17.
3912	413	Hoshiko, T.	1,476 00	1,449 00	BC/240-P	1,089 00	Five lots of this subdivision sold—Three lots remaining to be sold (BC/1356-B, BC/1385-B, BC/1391-B, (BC/1426-B and BC/2037-B).
3912	413	Hoshiko, T.	55 00	54 00	BC/240-P		
3885	436	Ikeda, G.	308 00	302 00	BC/526-P		
6775	440	Imahashi, I.	2,026 00	1,989 00	BC/527-P		
6906	471	Imahashi, T.	3,693 00	3,626 00	BC/528-P		Sub-division. See appendix No. 11.
5080	441	Imamasu, H. Y.	376 00	369 00	BC/2142-B	369 00	Sub-division. See appendix No. 3.
4979	433	Inokuchi, Y.	1,650 00	1,620 00	BC/1910-B	1,620 00	
8788	653	Inouye, Z.	3,980 00	3,908 00	BC/530-P		
10039	638	Ioki, H.	679 00	667 00	BC/1274-B	667 00	
3875	401	Ito, G.	1,041 00	1,022 00	BC/532-P	912 00	2 parts sold, 1 remaining. (BC/2665-B and BC/2686-B).

92279—34

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

... ALBERTA LIBRARY

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-123
www.nikkeimuseum.org

File No.	J. L.	Name	Appraisal	Sale Price	VLA File	Sold for by VLA	Remarks
			$ cts.	$ cts.		$ cts.	
4240	399	Ito, K.	228 00	224 00	BC/533-P		
4242	398	Ito, S.	3,777 00	3,709 00	BC/534-P	3,709 00	Sold in 2 parts. (BC/785-A and BC/1140-A).
6894	443	Kado, S.	1,101 00	1,081 00	BC/535-P		
13495	444	Kado, S.	382 00	375 00	BC/536-P		Cancelled. Title not obtained.
4935	438	Kanai, F.	3,750 00	3,682 00	BC/2099-A	4,000 00	Purchase price $4,000.
11862	494	Kato, T.	296 00	291 00	BC/2430-B	291 00	
7545	439	Katsumi, K.	617 00	606 00	BC/538-P		
6916	414	Kimura, T.	225 00	221 00	BC/1811-C	221 00	
Int. 799 1249	637	Kimura, S. Imahori, K.	472 00	463 00	BC/372-C	463 00	
3845	442	Kosugi, U.	1,060 00	1,041 00	BC/458-P		
6910	468	Kubodera, Y.	1,430 00	1,404 00	BC/2595-A	1,404 00	
7558	499	Kurahara, C.	502 00	493 00	BC/1647-B	493 00	
3851	478	Kurio, K.	95 00	93 00	BC/541-P		
3851	478	Kurio, K.	799 00	785 00	BC/541-P		
6892	403	Maeno, K.	1,870 00	1,836 00	BC/542-P	1,125 00	1 part sold, 1 part remaining (BC/2604-B).
3877	448	Maruno, T.	1,325 00	1,301 00	BC/543-P	815 00	1 part sold, 1 part remaining (BC/2664-B).
3881	745	Mori, S.	661 00	649 00	BC/544-P		
7719	509	Morimoto, S.	550 00	540 00	BC/1553-B	540 00	
6903	644	Morioka, K.	3,373 00	3,312 00	BC/546-P		Subdivision—see appendix 3.
4236 3873	576	Mototsune, K. Mototsune, T.	387 00	380 00	BC/1685-B	380 00	
7532	461	Naganobu, C.	1,159 00	1,138 00	BC/632-B	1,138 00	
6904	643	Nakamura, H.	2,992 00	2,938 00	BC/549-P		Subdivision—see appendix 3.
3847	432	Nakamura, J.	260 00	335 00	BC/2443-B	335 00	
3847	432	Nakamura, J.	245 00	241 00	BC/550-P		
6899	475	Nakamura, S.	1,600 00	1,571 00	BC/437-P		Subdivision—see appendix 3.
13433	546	Nakano, S. S.	299 00	294 00	BC/551-P		
10203	329	Nishiguchi, M.	3,822 00	3,753 00	BC/552-P		
6366	573	Nishihata, J.	757 00	743 00	BC/1418-B	743 00	
9602	498	Nishioka, S.	3,513 00	3,449 00	BC/553-P		
7041	574	Nobuhara, Z.	821 00	806 00	BC/3-P		
3320	579	Obana, E.	150 00	147 00	BC/554-P		Subdivision—see appendix No. 17.
8555	578	Obana, K.	525 00	516 00	BC/438-P		Subdivision—see appendix No. 7.
4943	508	Ohori, M.	1,994 00	1,958 00	BC/2212-A	1,958 00	
4936	446	Ohori, Y.	214 00	210 00	BC/555-P		
1652	577	Onishi, E.	225 00	221 00	BC/556-P		
8989	487	Onishi, T.	1,045 00	1,026 00	BC/2149-B	1,026 00	
Int. 1186	400	Ono, S.	1,114 00	1,094 00	BC/558-P		Subdivision—see appendix No. 3.

Int. 1186	405	Ono, S.	1,357 00	1,232 00	BC/559-P		Subdivision—see appendix No. 3—purchase price $1,332.00.
3628	482	Onodera, K.	1,060 00	1,041 00	BC/443-P	1,041 00	(2 pts.) V.L.A. records show J.L. 582 for (BC/2261-B and BC/2393B) this property.
5015	469	Osaka, G.	178 00	175 00	BC/560-P		
3709	470	Otani, T.	250 00	246 00	BC/561-P		
8982	450	Otsuki, S.	3,346 00	3,286 00	BC/562-P		
4626	450 A	Otsuki, T.	669 00	657 00	BC/2114-B	657 00	
7528	449	Riujin, M.	737 00	724 00	BC/1410-B	724 00	
6902	583	Sano, S.	1,618 00	1,589 00	BC/470-P		
3835	506	Sassa, T.	800 00	785 00	BC/564-P		Subdivision—see appendix No. 13.
3887	482	Sato, A.	1,278 00	1,255 00	BC/1369-A	1,255 00	
7536	476	Sato, T.	3,579 00	3,514 00	BC/566-P		Subdivision—see appendix No. 13.
3918	412	Shigehiro, S.	1,114 00	1,094 00	BC/234-B	1,094 00	
7338	597	Shimamoto, T.	418 00	411 00	BC/2132-B	411 00	
2298	488	Shinmoto, S.	1,064 00	1,045 00	BC/1890-B	1,045 00	
6908	483	Shinohara, K.	1,587 00	1,558 00	BC/569-P		
1506	486	Shintani, N.	346 00	340 00	BC/467-P		Cancelled—title not obtained.
3914	545	Takahashi, M.	565 00	555 00	BC/570-P		
14856	447	Tamaki, K.	50 00	49 00	BC/571-P		
14856	447	Tamaki, K.	32 00	42 00	BC/571-P		Purchase price $32.00.
3879	642	Tanaka, G.	650 00	638 00	BC/412-P		Cancelled—title not obtained.
8782	636	Tanizaki, M.	1,000 00	982 00	BC/479-P		Subdivision—see appendix No. 17.
4937	740	Tashima, H.	1,342 00	1,318 00	BC/572-P	1,318 00	(Sold in 2 parts) (BC/1561-B and BC/1635-B.).
3853	575	Tomita, H. (In trust)	1,402 00	1,377 00	BC/469-P	1,183 72	2 parts sold, 1 part remaining (BC/2346-B and BC/2590-B).
906	481	Tsuchida, S.	1,194 00	1,173 00	BC/2351-B	1,173 00	
8780	680	Tsuchimoto, Y.	525 00	515 00	BC/641-P		
4930	480	Tsukishima, H.	816 00	801 00	BC/574-P	564 50	1 part sold, 1 part remaining (BC/2292-B).
10156	581	Tsumura, A.	143 00	140 00	BC/575-P		
7424	462	Tsumura, C.	1,641 00	1,611 00	BC/745-P	1 00	(pt. only) to Secretary of State.
5614	544	Ujiye, F.	824 00	809 00	BC/475-P	249 88	2 parts sold, 1 part remaining. (BC/2123-B and BC/2173-B).
3837	507	Ujiye, S.	179 00	176 00	BC/577-P		
8781	510	Urano, S.	1,611 00	1,582 00	BC/1026-A	1,582 00	
6900	540	Watanabe, T.	1,488 00	1,461 00	BC/2166-A	1,461 00	
11116	472	Watanabe, U.	3,037 00	2,982 00	BC/580-P		Subdivision—see appendix No. 11.
7527	463	Yamasaki, S.	116 00	114 00	BC/466-P		
7527	463	Yamasaki, S.	691 00	678 00	BC/466-P	231 85	Purchase price $800.00, 1 part sold (BC/2406-B), 1 part remaining.
5447	570	Yamashita, M.	1,617 00	1,588 00	BC/576-P		Subdivision—see appendix 3.
3889	484	Yasui, S.	691 00	678 00	BC/573-P		
12336	479	Yoshioka, Y.	270 00	265 00	BC/519-P		
3783	422	Fujii, H.	750 00	809 00	BC/487-P		Subdivision—see appendix No. 12.
3783	422	Fujii, H.	1,741 00	1,850 34	BC/2260-B	1,850 34	
3362	396	Hinatsu, K.	2,492 00	2,447 00	BC/294-A	2,447 00	

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-124
www.nikkeimuseum.org

File No.	J. L.	Name	Appraisal	Sale Price	VLA File	Sold for by VLA	Remarks
			$ cts.	$ cts.		$ cts.	
4064	429	Hirashima, Y.	892 00	876 00	BC/847-B	876 00	
10465	428	Hosaka, C.	985 00	967 00	BC/2553-B	967 00	
7303	424	Ito, M.	373 00	366 00	BC/492-P	.....	
10657	453	Kaita, K.	241 00	237 00	BC/493-P	.....	
3765	464	Kaita, S.	778 00	764 00	BC/494-P	.....	
8664	431	Kaita, T.	1,200 00	1,178 00	BC/416-P	.....	
4218	455	Kamiya, J.	1,024 00	1,005 00	BC/495-P	.....	Subdivision—see appendix No. 12.
3830	430	Katsumoto, J.	775 00	761 00	BC/496-P	.....	
4603	417	Kishiyama, K.	700 00	687 00	BC/497-P	.....	
10987	420	Kitagawa, S.	614 00	603 00	BC/498-P	.....	Cancelled, title not obtained.
4216	454	Kobayashi, S.	727 00	714 00	BC/499-P	.....	
4206	423	Minaki, K.	800 00	785 00	BC/440-P	.....	
7380	388	Miyada, Y.	883 00	867 00	BC/500-P	.....	
8679	419	Mori, K.	1,465 00	1,439 00	BC/1450-A	1,439 00	
7281	383	Nagamatsu, D.	2,723 00	2,674 00	BC/272-B	2,674 00	
8684	421	Nagamatsu, G.	775 00	761 00	BC/503-P	.....	
1540	427	Nagamatsu, S.	550 00	540 00	.....	.....	Sold February, 1943.
7379	418	Nagamatsu, S.	93 00	91 00	BC/504-P	.....	
1482	426	Nagamatsu, T.	1,224 00	1,202 00	BC/1352-B	1,202 00	
4204	384	Nishizawa, U.	600 00	589 00	BC/505-P	.....	
4200	411	Nishiziki, T.	809 00	794 00	BC/506-P	.....	
4198	416	Osaki, K.	852 00	837 00	BC/1249-A	837 00	
1720	395	Osato, F. S.	838 00	823 00	BC/675-P	.....	
4249 4247	459	Saito, S. Saito, T.	1,163 00	1,142 00	BC/2618-A	1,142 00	
8273	387	Saito, S.	775 00	761 00	BC/508-P	.....	
5909	385	Sakamoto, K.	2,089 00	2,051 00	BC/509-P	.....	
4235	425	Suzuki, S.	1,238 00	1,216 00	BC/328-B	1,216 00	
4235	425	Suzuki, S.	363 00	356 00	BC/510-P	.....	
4233	410	Tatsumi, S.	850 00	835 00	BC/424-P	.....	
4231 3663	457	Teramura, C. Teramura, K.	422 00	414 00	BC/6678P	.....	Purchase price $300.00.
4209	458	Umemoto, Y.	83 00	82 00	BC/511-P	.....	
5002	677	Yamada, K.	3,001 00	2,947 00	BC/512-P	.....	Subdivision—see appendix No. 12.
5005	456	Yamada, Y.	421 00	413 00	BC/2673-B	413 00	
5004	389	Yamasaki, I.	790 00	775 00	BC/513-P	.....	
10835	557	Doi, T.	1,800 00	1,767 00	BC/2424-B	1,767 00	
3293	474	Ebata, G.	3,100 00	3,004 00	BC/643-P	.....	Subdivision—see appendix No. 15—Purchase price $3,044.00.
741	732	Fujino, M.	80 00	79 00	BC/274-B	79 00	J. L. 734 and 738 also sold, same account.
2139	733	Fukushima, J.	2,066 00	2,029 00	BC/426-P		
12149	526	Furukawa, S.	1,000 00	982 00	BC/22ee-B	982 00	

1396	525	Hamamoto, U.	1,350 00	1,326 00	BC/673-P	.....	Cancelled—title not obtained.
6643	734	Hamura, M.	2,081 00	2,043 00	BC/274-B	2,043 00	J.L. 738 and 732 also sold, same account.
12252	533	Hashimoto, Y.	700 00	687 00	BC/2280-B	687 00	
3385	519	Hayashi, E.	600 00	589 00	BC/2143-B	589 00	
4967	515	Hayashi, R.	1,998 00	1,962 00	BC/2453-B	1,962 00	
4970	566	Hikida, M.	1,800 00	1,767 00	BC/594-P	.....	
4973	561	Hikida, T.	1,198 00	1,176 00	BC/668-P	1,176 00	Sold in 2 parts. (BC/2214-B) and (BC/2388-B).
3308 1467 2915 7039	703	Hikida, Y. Yasui, U. Shirakawa, K. Takahashi, G.	355 00	349 00	BC/2400-B	349 00	
3308 Int. 1401 11275 7039	491	Hikida, Y. Yoshida, S. Koshiba, T. Takahashi, G.	3,828 00	3,759 00	BC/645-P	.....	Cancelled—title not obtained.
3308 Int. 1401 11275 7039	491	Hikida, Y. Yoshida, S. Koshiba, T. Takahashi, G.	1,006 00	988 00	.....	.....	Withdrawn—died prior to 26 February, 1942.
3429	620	Hirata, I.	1,712 00	1,681 00	BC/585-P	1,706 00	·09 acre of non-Jap. property at $25.00—same account.
1755	562	Hirose, T.	201 00	197 00	BC/690-P	.....	
6046	735	Hommura, K.	133 00	131 00	BC/646-P	.....	
1444	493	Nakamura, G.	1,000 00	982 00	BC/229-P	.....	Subdivision—see appendix No. 15.
4972	524	Kawabata, B.	1,200 00	1,178 00	BC/647-P	614 00	1 part sold, 1 part remaining. (BC/2245-B).
1608	736	Kawamoto, C.	137 00	134 00	BC/648-P	.....	
5552	543	Kawase, T.	10,568 00	10,377 00	BC/478-P	10,377 00	Sold in 2 parts (BC-1974-A and BC/2543-A).
2304	548	Kobayashi, K.	3,100 00	3,044 00	BC/1922-B	3,044 00	
691	555	Kochi, Y.	500 00	491 00	BC/681-P	.....	
1786	707	Komori, H.	1,779 00	1,747 00	BC/669-P	.....	
1758		Komori, E.					Cancelled—title not obtained.
9943 1785	473	Komori, M. Komori, T.	3,419 00	3,357 00	BC/486-P	3,437 00	Sold in 4 parts—$80. P.I. effected (BC/2050-B, BC/2038-B, BC/1997-B, BC/2217-B).
5133	565	Konishi, I.	2,650 00	2,602 00	BC/270-B	2,602 00	
Int. 484	517	Koyanagi, R.	258 00	253 00	BC/606-P	.....	
5448	737	Koyanagi, S.	84 00	82 00	BC/649-P	.....	
2266	505	Kumagai, S.	1,793 00	1,761 00	BC/435-P	1,200 00	Part sold to British Columbia Electric Railway Company.
4976	527	Matsuba, S.	1,105 00	1,085 00	BC/600-P	906 20	2 parts sold, BC/2106-C, BC/2428-B, 1 part remaining.
4585 10056	556	Miyamoto, M. Miyamoto, H.	675 00	663 00	BC/650-P	.....	
14369	514	Mineoka, T.	2,026 00	1,989 00	BC/651-P	1,889 00	1 part including bldgs. sold, 1 part remaining (BC/1020-B).

U. ALBERTA LIBRARY

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-125
www.nikkeimuseum.org

File No.	J. L.	Name	Appraisal	Sale Price	VLA File	Sold for by VLA	Remarks
			$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	
4960 / 4975 / 4489	605	Mori, M. / Mori, K. / Mori, S.	2,350 00	2,307 00	BC/595-B		
7294	662	Mori, T.	80 00	79 00	BC/652-P		
3465	738	Motomura, K.	80 00	79 00	BC/274-B	79 00	J. L. 732 and 734 also sold, same account.
3917	549	Murakami, A.	2,945 00	2,892 00	BC/1645-B	2,892 00	
661	536	Murakami, I.	575 00	565 00	BC/2479-B		
661	536	Murakami, I.	896 00	880 00	BC/2479-B	880 00	
13720	537	Murakami, K.	1,407 00	1,382 00	BC/1725-B	1,382 00	
689	645	Myzuguchi, D.	80 00	79 00	BC/654-P		
9062	656	Nakade, S.	650 00	638 00			Withdrawn, sold prior to offer.
5551	559	Nakane, M.	2,776 00	2,726 00	BC/266-B	2,726 00	
11009	518	Naruse, H. K.	4,150 00	4,075 00	BC/1172-P		Sub-division—see Appendix 7.
9208	564	Nishida, M.	1,500 00	1,473 00	BC/590-P		
9208	564	Nishida, M.	1,000 00	982 00	BC/596-P		
4966	541	Nishii, K.	2,125 00	2,086 00	BC/483-C	2,086 00	
3919	523	Nishi, S.	1,500 00	1,473 00	BC/301-B	1,473 00	
4997	534	Nishi, S.	975 00	957 00	BC/2599-C	957 00	
3919 / 3859	522	Nishi, S. / Nishi, H.	500 00	591 00	BC/677-P		Purchase price $491.00.
5156	542	Nishii, T.	877 00	861 00	BC/678-P	587 33	2 parts sold, 1 part remaining (BC/2144-B, BC/2270-B).
4968	535	Okamoto, H.	218 00	214 00	BC/2082-B	214 00	J.L. 558 also sold, same account.
4968	535	Okamoto, H.	417 00	409 00	BC/2353-B	409 00	
13542	539	Okimi, N.	1,100 00	1,080 00			Sold by Official Administrator.
8837	612	River Fish Co. Ltd.	5,142 00	5,049 00			
8837	612	River Fish Co. Ltd.	120 00	118 00	BC/750-P		Total purchase price for 3 parcels, $6,000.
8837	612	River Fish Co. Ltd.	80 00	79 00			
6225 / 4586	526	Sakiyama, F. / Sakayama, K.	850 00	835 00	BC/680-P		
5408	503	Sasaki, C.	761 00	747 00	BC/587-P		
5408	509	Sasaki, G. C.	1,135 00	1,114 00	BC/655-P		
13808 / 1516	500	Sasaki, S. / Sasaki, T.	1,589 00	1,560 00			Withdrawn—died prior to 26/2/42.
5963	504	Sasaki, S.	1,391 90	1,366 00	BC/588-P		
1512	497	Sato, I.	3,033 00	2,978 00	BC/581-P		
5571	558	Shiho, S.	1,100 00	1,080 00	BC/2082-B	1,120 00	$40 P.I. effected—J.L. 535 also sold, same account.
1739	516	Shimano, K.	1,912 00	1,877 00	BC/560-P		
1743	529	Shimano, S.	725 00	712 00	BC/591-P		
4989	529	Shimano, M.					
4988	551	Shoji, T.	875 00	859 00	BC/1411-B	859 00	
8861	661	Sammoto, Y.	1,640 00	1,610 00	BC/1371-B	1,610 00	
5457	501	Suda, K.	1,268 00	1,245 00	BC/465-P		
12885	532	Suzuki, Y.	912 00	896 00	BC/1273-B	896 00	
6684	550	Taguchi, K.	925 00	908 00	BC/1653-B	908 00	
11164	530	Takahashi, F.	2,695 00	2,646 00	BC/472-P		Subdivision—see appendix 14.
11929	502	Takeda, H.	1,032 00	1,013 00			Withdrawn.
13499	521	Teranishi, F.	1,062 00	1,043 00	BC/658-P	1,043 00	Sold in 2 parts (BC/2189-B and BC/2216-B).
3389	739	Teshima, N.	2,076 00	2,038 00	BC/2323-B	2,038 00	
4974	538	Yamamoto, Y.	1,927 00	1,892 00	BC/2341-N	1,892 00	
4964 / 6095	513	Yamamoto, Y. / Yamamoto, M.	1,920 00	1,885 00	BC/434-P		
4229	531	Yoneda, H.	1,300 00	1,277 00	BC/2583-B	1,277 00	
1733	609	Yonemoto, G.	1,500 00	1,473 00	BC/1334-C	1,473 00	
4593	660	Yoshida, K.	1,512 00	1,485 00	BC/655-P	1,485 00	Sold in 2 parts (BC/1367-B and BC/1999-B).
Int. 1401	492	Yoshida, S.	2,092 00	2,054 00	BC/485-P	2,054 00	Sold in 2 parts (BC/2403-B and BC/2578-B).
Int. 1041	492	Yoshida, S.	3,875 00	3,805 00	BC/485-P	3,805 00	Sold in 4 parts (BC/1639-B, BC/1695-B, BC/1853-B, BC/1812-B).
Int. 722 / 2315	520	Yoshisaki, Y. / Isomura, T.	1,570 00	1,542 00	BC/657-P		
9668 / 11337	306	Tsuchihashi, G. / Yasuda, T.	1,075 00	1,056 00	BC/1921-A	1,056 00	
10583	236	Adachi, A.	7,213 00	7,083 00	BC/2560-A	7,083 00	
Int. 1352	140	Nagamine, N.	191 00	189 00	BC/608-P		
5491	408	Nakashima, T.	3,829 00	3,760 00	BC/609-P		
5420	23	Shikaze, K.	875 00	859 00			Withdrawn—offer deficient.
2312	407	Shikaze, M.	1,440 00	1,414 00	BC/610-P		
2877	114	Tatevama, I.	2,867 00	2,815 00	BC/611-P	2,040 00	1 part sold, 1 part remaining (BC/2666-A).
6623	409	Yamanouchi, K.	467 00	459 00	BC/2046-A	1,974 00	
6623	409	Yamanouchi, K.	1,543 00	1,515 00			
4647	465	Akagawa, Y.	478 00	4,000 00	BC/792-B	4,000 00	Error in original appraisal.
Int. 422	452	Konishi, K.	102 00	100 00	BC/245-P	50 00	1 part sold, 1 part remaining (BC/2489-B).
12895	512	Kumagai, M.	203 00	199 00	BC/236-B	3,255 00	Cash sale.
12900	511	Kumagai, J.	3,112 00	3,056 00			
1626	451	Matsushita, C.	570 00	560 00	BC/255-P	247 60	2 parts sold, 2 parts remaining (BC/1529-B & BC/1479-B).
11490	496	Mitsui, S.	2,457 00	2,413 00	BC/258-P		
4241	386	Sakamoto, M.	450 00	442 00	BC/261-P		
10021	466	Takahira, S.	1,231 00	1,209 00	BC/270-P		Subdivision—see Appendix No. 16.
1759	490	Takahira, F.R.	169 00	166 00	BC/273-P		Subdivision—see Appendix 16.
Int. 1342	495	Yasuzawa, S.	50 00	49 00	BC/282-P		
12995	742	Hamagaki, I.	110 00	108 00	BC/1862-B	108 00	Cash sale.
1596	746	Kawasaki, M.	1,710 00	697 00			Sold June, 1943.
10873	748	Konishi, H.	1,547 00	1,519 00	BC/139-A	1,519 00	
10873	748	Konishi, H.	Nil	Nil			

OF ALBERTA LIBRARY

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-126
www.nikkeimuseum.org

File No.	J. L.	Name	Appraisal	Sale Price	VLA File	Sold for by VLA	Remarks
			$ cts.	$ cts.		$ cts.	
10875	747	Konishi, S.	750 00	736 00			Sold October, 1938.
10875	749	Konishi, S.	196 00	193 00	BC/733-P		
3441	741	Yamazaki, B.	48 00	48 00	BC/734-P		
768			865,672 00	849,999 00			
				3,818 22			
768			865,672 00	853,817 22			
68			62,684 00	61,552 00			
709			802,988 00	792,265 22			
5427	925	Ayukawa, K.	708 00	694 00	BC/685-P		
4611	918	Ayukawa, S.	1,434 00	1,405 00	BC/2672-B	1,405 00	
5437	921	Ikebuchi, T.	477 00	467 00	BC/730-P		
5333		Hayashi, T.	752 00	737 00	BC/729-P		
9781	920	Takahashi, Y.	640 00	627 00	BC/250-B	627 00	
5580	912	Tonomitsu, H.	123 00	121 00	BC/250-B	121 00	
5580	913	Tonomitsu, H.	350 00	343 00	BC/693-P		
5581	919	Tsuji, S. T.	863 00	846 00	BC/697-P		
3006	911	Yamada, S.	935 00	916 00	BC/1646-A	916 00	
9340	924	Nakashima, F.	207 00	203 00	BC/1703-B	203 00	
6909	917	Hinatsu, Y.	345 00	338 00	BC/696-P		
4816	916	Ikeda, A.					
4983		Ikeda, R.					
4241	386A	Sakamoto, M.	584 00	572 00	BC/698-P		
1534	799	Morisawa, N.	594 00	582 00	BC/707-P		Cancelled—title not obtained.
5511	759	Tamura, T.					
5452		Tamuka, K.	1,127 00	1,104 00	BC/717-P		
9509	806	Nishimura, C.	1,052 00	1,031 00	BC/721-P		
11357	804	Sakata, M.	867 00	850 00	BC/720-P		
5201	803	Yoshida, C.	964 00	945 00	BC/719-P		
5360	775	Nakashima, E.	550 00	539 00	BC/718-P		
1362	771	Nagata, K.	746 00	731 00	BC/723-P		
5950	902	Sumi, C.	1,454 00	1,425 00	BC/722-P	760 00	(3 parts sold) 6 parts remaining (BC/1895-C).
4996	762	Kato, F. T.	1,041 00	1,020 00	BC/2133-B	1,020 00	
Int. 1251	760	Uchiyama, T.	2,148 00	2,105 00	BC/2367-B	2,105 00	
Int. 1251	760	Uchiyama, T.	616 00	604 00	BC/2367-B	604 00	
4004	574	Tateishi, I.	1,616 00	1,584 00	BC/725-P		
4952	894	Kobayakawa, M.	1,400 00	1,372 00	BC/724-P		
Int. 1330		Kobayakawa, H.	1,576 00	1,544 00	BC/492-B	1,544 00	
3273	781	Midada, M.	1,310 00	1,284 00	BC/2361-B	1,284 00	
1364	782	Murakami, K.	1,008 00	988 00	BC/711-P		
3277	783	Murakami, T.	177 00	174 00	BC/712-P		
3277	784	Murakami, T.	989 00	969 00	BC/2079-B	969 00	
3269	780	Ito, N.	2,390 00	2,342 00	BC/2277-A	2,342 00	
3275	785	Murakami, M.	2,986 00	2,926 00	BC/714-P		
3281	795	Okano, K.					
3281	795	Okano, K.					
2139		Okano, M.	250 00	245 00	BC/715-P	2,000 00	Sold to Henry Frederick Hollings, Civilian, as a cash sale.
2137	801	Okano, J. S.	193 00	189 00	BC/716-P		
5141	794	Minamide, B.	2,840 00	2,783 00	BC/700-P		
5141	797	Minamide, B.					
5162		Minamide, M.	1,516 00	1,486 00	BC/702-P		
5166	813	Nagata, K.	3,000 00	2,940 00	BC/704-P		
5139	796	Sumi, K.	1,174 00	1,150 00	BC/701-P		
5143	792	Sumi, J. K.	1,932 00	1,893 00	BC/1336-A	1,893 00	
5158	800	Kadonaga, T.	1,689 00	1,655 00	BC/703-P		
2569	793	Sasaki, K.	661 00	648 00	BC/705-P		
5164	814	Konishi, K.	200 00	196 00	BC/706-P		
42			45,484 00	44,573 00			
1			594 00	582 00			
41			44,890 00	43,991 00			

UNIVERSITY
OF ALBERTA LIBRARY

APPENDIX No. 1

HANEY SUB-DIVISION

File	Vendor	Purchase Price
J.L. 248	Morikawa, K.	$ 3,099.00
J.L. 72	Tamura, M. & T.	664.00
J.L. 73	Kumamoto, H. & T.	1,455.00
J.L. 74	Kumamoto, K. & T.	668.00
J.L. 122	Nakano, A.	803.00
	TOTAL COST PRICE	$ 6,709.00
	Less $75.00 for buildings sold	75.00
		$ 6,634.00
	20 Lots sold—Total Value	6,106.59
	19 Lots to be sold at	$ 527.41

N.B.—Existing Permanent Improvements valued at $4,800.00 included in 2 of Lots sold.

APPENDIX No. 2.

MISSION SUB-DIVISION

File	Vendor	Purchase Price
J.L. 22	Tatabe, K.	$ 746.00
J.L. 34	Tonomura, M.	589.00
J.L. 23	Shikaze, K.	542.00
J.L. 136	Umetsu, K.	1,827.00
J.L. 88	Watanabe, Y.	1,178.00
	TOTAL COST PRICE	$ 4,882.00
	Less Sale of Buildings on J.L. 22	35.00
		$ 4,847.00
	26 Lots sold at	3,912.00
	4 Lots remaining to be sold at total of	$ 935.00

APPENDIX No. 3.

File	Vendor	Purchase Price
J.L. 471	Imahashi, T.	$ 3,626.00
J.L. 400	Ono, S.	1,094.00
J.L. 405	Ono, S.	1,332.00
J.L. 570	Yamashita, M.	1,588.00
J.L. 475	Nakamura, S.	1,571.00
J.L. 644	Morioka, K.	3,312.00
J.L. 643	Nakamura, H.	2,938.00
	TOTAL COST PRICE	$ 15,461.00
	Less Sale of Fencing from J.L. 644	7.20
		$ 15,453.00
	18 Lots sold—TOTAL	14,508.80
	12 Lots to be sold at	$ 945.00

N.B.—Existing Permanent Improvements valued at $13,100.00, included in 7 of lots sold.

APPENDIX No. 4.

File	Vendor	Purchase Price
J.L. 296	Yamada, S.	$ 2,327.00
J.L. 678	Imanura, K.	991.00
J.L. 678	Imamura, K.	1,619.00
	TOTAL COST PRICE	$ 4,937.00
	2 Lots Sold Prior to Sub-Division at	3,005.10
	1 Lot Sold After Sub-Division at	585.85
	4 Lots remaining to be Sold at	$ 1,346.05

N.B.—Existing Permanent Improvements were included in first 2 lots sold.

APPENDIX No. 5.

File	Vendor	Purchase Price.
J.L. 69	Nakahara, H.	$ 2,362.00
J.L. 105	Hosaki, I.	3,113.00
J.L. 68	Kawamoto, S.	1,738.00
	TOTAL COST PRICE	$ 7,213.00
	6 Lots sold—Total Sale Price	6,259.30
	4 Lots remaining to be sold at total of	953.70

N.B.—Existing Permanent Improvements included in 3 of the 6 lots sold.

APPENDIX No. 6.

File	Vendor	Purchasing Price
J.L. 39	Oike, JK.	$ 3,392.00
J.L. 70	Takashita, T.	2,145.00
	TOTAL COST PRICE	$ 5,537.00
	8 Lots sold for	5,303.12
	1 Lot to be sold at	$ 233.88

N.B.—Existing Permanent Improvements included in the Lots sold.

APPENDIX No. 7.

HERBERT SUB-DIVISION

File	Vendor	Purchasing Price
J.L. 518	Naruse, H. K.	$ 4,075.00

N.B.—This parcel combined with the E. H. Herbert property for Sub-Division purposes. Lots sold at their proportionate cost.

APPENDIX No. 8.

File	Vendor	Purchasing Price
J.L. 61	Gyotoku, U.	$ 1,106.00
J.L. 52	Tazumi, A.	1,178.00
J.L. 42	Mukai, O.	579.00
	TOTAL COST PRICE	$ 2,863.00
	3 Lots sold, Total Sale Price	1,709.10
	4 Lots remaining to be sold at total of	$ 1,153.90

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-127
www.nikkeimuseum.org

APPENDIX No. 9.

File	Vendor	Purchasing Price
J.L. 244	Eto, S.	$ 2,835.00
J.L. 245	Kusano, A.	1,623.00
	TOTAL COST PRICE	$ 4,458.00
	TOTAL SALE PRICE (4 lots)	$ 4,458.00

APPENDIX No. 10.

File	Vendor	Purchasing Price
J.L. 601	Takata, H. Y.	$ 669.00
J.L. 602	Wakai, S. and Wakai, C.	1,754.00
	TOTAL COST PRICE	$ 2,423.00
	1 Lot sold at	671.00
	4 Lots to be sold at	$ 1,752.00

N.B.—Existing Permanent Improvements included in Lot sold.

APPENDIX No. 11.

File	Vendor	Purchasing Price
J.L. 440	Imahashi, I.	$ 1,989.00
J.L. 472	Watanabe, U.	2,982.00
	TOTAL COST PRICE	$ 4,971.00
	4 Lots sold—Total Value	2,879.00
	2 Lots to be sold—Total Value	$ 2,092.00

APPENDIX No. 12.

File	Vendor	Purchasing Price
J.L. 422	Fujii, H.	$ 300.00
J.L. 677	Yamada, K.	2,947.00
J.L. 455	Kamiya, J.	1,005.00
	TOTAL COST PRICE	$ 4,752.00
	4 Lots sold—Total Sale Price	4,477.00
	*3 Lots remaining to be sold for total of	$ 275.00

*Existing Permanent Improvements were included in the 4 lots sold.

APPENDIX No. 13.

File	Vendor	Purchasing Price
J.L. 506	Sasaa, T.	$ 785.00
J.L. 476	Sato, T.	3,514.00
	TOTAL COST PRICE	$ 4,299.00
	5 Lots sold—Total Value	2,021.42
	3 Lots to be sold for Total of	$ 2,277.58

APPENDIX No. 14.

File	Vendor	Purchasing Price
J.L. 530	Takahashi, F.	$ 2,646.00
	3 Lots sold—Total Sale Price	2,071.00
	*2 Lots remaining to be sold for total of	$ 575.00

*Existing Permanent Improvements included in the 3 Lots sold.

APPENDIX No. 15.

File	Vendor	Purchasing Price
J.L. 474	Ebata, G.	$ 3,044.00
J.L. 493	Nakamura, G.	982.00
	TOTAL COST PRICE	$ 4,026.00
	Less Sale of Buildings on J.L. 474	50.00
		$ 3,976.00
	Less Fire Loss Recovery on J.L. 493	700.00
		$ 3,276.00

N.B.—These parcels combined with the Jessie Tait property for Sub-Division purposes. Lots sold at their proportionate cost.

APPENDIX No. 16.

File	Vendor	Purchasing Price
J.L. 466	Takahira, S.	$ 1,209.00
J.L. 490	Takahira, S.	166.00
	TOTAL COST PRICE	$ 1,375.00
	6 Lots sold—Total Sale Price	1,297.80
	1 Lot remaining to be sold for	$ 77.20

N.B.—Existing Permanent Improvements in Lots sold.

APPENDIX No. 17.

File	Vendor	Purchasing Price
J.L. 578	Obana, K.	$ 516.00
J.L. 579	Obana, E.	147.00
J.L. 900	Honda, G.	565.00
J.L. 636	Tanizaki, M.	982.00
	TOTAL COST PRICE	$ 2,210.00

These lands sold to the Corporation of the District of Surrey as a Sewage Disposal Plant Site.

SALE PRICE $ 2,800.00

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-128
www.nikkeimuseum.org

APPENDIX "B"

According to Veterans' Land Act files, Appendix "A" requires amendment in the following particulars to record actual sale prices:—

Custodian's file JL	V.L.A. file BC	Custodian's sale price	Actual V.L.A. purchase price	Remarks
		$ cts.	$ cts.	
145	311-P	1,352 00	1,425 00	Custodian unable deliver title and parcel withdrawn; subsequently bought in December, 1944, at $1,425.00.
173	313-P	1,132 00	426 00	The increase of $353 recorded should be a decrease representing fire loss recovered by the Custodian before sale to Director.
180	329-P	2,041 00	1,465 00	Original appraisal covered 2 lots. Custodian unable deliver title to one lot. The figure recorded as an increase should be shown as a decrease.
175	2051-B	1,489 90	1,489 00	
123	2058-A	2,054 00	1,600 00	Appraisal covered 2 lots. Custodian able to deliver title to but one lot. The increase of $227 should be shown as a decrease.
693	2449-A	1,689 00	2,500 00	Custodian unable deliver title and original offer was cancelled. Parcel later bought in January, 1946, at $2,500.
438	2699-A	3,082 00	4,000 00	Custodian unable deliver title and parcel withdrawn. Subsequently purchased in July, 1945, at $4,000.
447	571-P	42.00	32.00	
463	466-P	678 00	800 00	Custodian unable deliver title and offer cancelled. Subsequently bought in December, 1944, at $800.
474	643-P	3,004 00	3,044 00	
522	677-P	591 00	491 00	
612	750-P	5,246 00	6,000 00	Recorded as withdrawn but bought by Director in August, 1945, at $6,000.

OTTAWA, June 6, 1947.

1947

SESSION 1947

HOUSE OF COMMONS

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 16

FRIDAY, JUNE 27, 1947

WITNESSES:

Dr. E. H. Coleman, C.M.G., K.C., Deputy Custodian of Enemy Property; Mr. A. H. Mathieu, M.B.E., Assistant Deputy Custodian, and Mr. K. W. Wright, Counsel.

OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., B.A., L.Ph.,
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
1947

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-129
www.nikkeimuseum.org

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

FRIDAY, June 27, 1947.

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts met at 11 o'clock a.m., the Chairman, Mr. L. P. Picard, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Burton, Boucher, Case, Cloutier, Fraser, Gladstone, Golding, Hamel, Homuth, Isnor, Jaenicke, Macdonnell, Picard, Rinfret, Warren, Winkler.

In attendance: Dr. E. H. Coleman, C.M.G., K.C., Deputy Custodian of Enemy Property, Mr. A. H. Mathieu, M.B.E., Assistant Deputy Custodian, and Mr. K. W. Wright, Counsel.

The Committee resumed its investigation into the administration of the Ottawa office of the Custodian.

Dr. Coleman and Messrs. Mathieu and Wright were recalled.

Mr. Wright filed a statement showing particulars of sales of certain properties owned by persons of the Japanese race, which, on motion of Mr. Warren, was ordered to be printed as *Appendix "A"* to this day's minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Mr. Mathieu filed a statement of audit fees paid by the Custodian, which, on motion of Mr. Warren, was ordered to be printed as *Appendix "B"* to this day's minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Questioning of Mr. Mathieu was resumed.

The Chairman thanked the witnesses for their cooperation.

Dr. Coleman, on behalf of himself and officers of his department, thanked the Committee for the consideration shown them in their examination.

The witnesses retired.

It was agreed that Mr. Watson Sellar be examined at the next meeting.

At 12.30 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned until Tuesday, July 1, at 11 o'clock a.m.

A. L. BURGESS,
Clerk of the Committee.

92281—1½

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-130
www.nikkeimuseum.org

The WITNESS: The only restriction imposed on that type of man was he could not buy stocks in a Canadian company to try and get control of a Canadian company as a German national.

Mr. Picard resumed the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions gentlemen?

Well, this will be practically the last meeting with these witnesses. We have covered most of this phase of the work and there remained only the custodian's office in Ottawa and the accounts. If the committee members are satisfied that we are through we will release the witnesses.

I am sure I express the opinion of the committee in thanking Dr. Coleman, Mr. Mathieu, and Mr. Wright for their willingness to answer our questions all the way through. They have given us the best information they could.

Dr. COLEMAN: Mr. Chairman, may I, on behalf of the witnesses from the custodian's office, thank not only you but your predecessor, Mr. Isnor, and all the members of the committee for their courtesy. I assure you that if there is any further information that you want and which is within our power to produce we will be very glad to supply it, if you will just let us know.

Mr. BURTON: Mr. Chairman, you fully expressed the appreciation of all the members of the committee but there is just one other question I would like to ask before you call the adjournment. Is it the intention of the committee to proceed along the lines we did before when we had completed one phase of our investigation? Is it the intention to prepare another further interim report?

The CHAIRMAN: I am quite prepared to assume the work. Since we are changing entirely the subject matter of work on Tuesday at 11.00 a.m., we will see Mr. Sellar for a general broad outlook of his work.

Mr. HOMUTH: On Tuesday?

The CHAIRMAN: On Tuesday at 11.00 a.m. and immediately after we finish with Mr. Sellar's general outlook of the programme we will take up the matter that has been brought forward by Mr. Fleming respecting the Veterans' Land Act administration in Sarnia.

Mr. HOMUTH: That will be on Tuesday morning?

The CHAIRMAN: On Tuesday morning Mr. Sellar will be here and if we do not get through with him at one session I might suggest, to please Mr. Fleming, that we have a second meeting on Wednesday and on Thursday or Friday we that has been brought forward by Mr. Fleming respecting the Veterans' Land Act

The meeting stands adjourned until Tuesday at 11.00 a.m.

The meeting adjourned at 12.20 p.m. to meet again on Tuesday, July 1, 1947, at 11.00 a.m.

APPENDIX "A"

June 27, 1947.

Memorandum for the Public Accounts Committee

In compliance with Mr. Fleming's request, the following information has been obtained from the Custodian's Office in Vancouver in regard to sales of properties which were made subsequent to acceptance of offers for numerous parcels listed on Pages 174 and 175 of Minutes of Proceedings before Public Accounts Committee, May 13, 1947.

Original Offer	Final Offer	Date	Remarks
$1,325.00	$1,425.00	December, 1944	Sale based on valuation by Mr. H. Menzies, Haney, B.C.
678.00	800.00	December, 1944	Sale based on valuation by Mr. Ansell, of New Westminster, B.C.
9,117.00	10,100.00	December, 1944	Property advertised in Catalogue published by Custodian.

Properties obtained through Official Administrator who took out Letters of Administration to Japanese Estates:

Original Offer	Final Offer	Date	Remarks
$3,682.00	$4,000.00	July, 1945	Public Tender.
1,689.00	2,500.00	June, 1946	Public Tender.

The Director, Custodian's Office, Vancouver, further advises that receipts from sales of these five parcels are included in Summary of Realization of Assets, listed on page 57 of the General Report under Item "Real Estate Sales" which totals $1,868,080.66.

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-131
www.nikkeimuseum.org

AUDIT FEES PAID BY "THE CUSTODIAN"

RE: WORLD WAR I

Periods Covered	To Edwards, Morgan, & Company	To Price, Waterhouse Company Montreal	Audit Board
From inception to February 29, 1944	$2,975.80	.....	
March 1, 1924 to November, 30 1924	960.48	.....	
December 1, 1924 to November 30, 1925	1,526.52	.....	
December 1, 1925 to December 31, 1926	1,245 80	.....	
Audit Board from January 1, 1926 to February 29, 1928	.....	.....	Paid by Treasury not by Custodian's Office. No information in Custodian's Office.
March 1, 1928 to September 30, 1930	.....	$13,094.25	
October 1, 1933 to March 31, 1931	.....	2,597.30	
April 1, 1931 to December 31, 1931	.....	1,833.74	
1932	.....	1,185.90	
1933	.....	1,176.35	
1934	.....	1,562.49	
1935	.....	1,202.99	
1936	.....	940.45	
1937	.....	652.52	
1938	.....	568.68	
January, February and March, 1939	.....	141.70	
April 1, 1939 to December 31, 1940	.....	275 00	
January 1, 1941 to August 31, 1944	.....	528.62	
September 1, 1944 to December 31, 1945	.....	100.00	

RE: WORLD WAR II

Periods Covered	Price, Waterhouse & Company, Montreal	Price, Waterhouse & Company, Vancouver	P. S. Ross & Sons, Vancouver
Interim Report covering period of September 2, 1939 to December 31, 1940	$ 5,567.65	.....	
Official Report for period of September 2, 1939 to December 31, 1941	13,718.57	.....	
1942	14,480.53	.....	
1943	10,906.05	.....	
1944	7,472.83	.....	
1945	9,734.20	.....	
Japanese Enemy Section Audit Fee	.....	2,500.00	
Japanese Evacuation Section Audit Fee	.....	.....	4,109.61

Source: Nikkei National Museum, 2018-16-1-45-1-132
www.nikkeimuseum.org