Name of Claimant SHIMIZU Shoji Case 1041

Custodian File 8894

REAL PROPERTY												Total
Greater Vancouver		Rural (except V.L.A.)			V.L.A. (except Mission Village)			V.L.A. Mission Village				
Sale Price	5% thereof & 12.50	Sale Price	10% there-of	Charges 12.50 & Comm.	Sale Price	Total Award 80% of all Sale Prices		Sale Price	Total Award 125% of all Sale Prices:			
						% of Total	Amount		% of Total	Amount		
		10,500 2,900	1050 290	525 145 25	+	$1000	SPECIAL					1000 2035

PERSONAL PROPERTY								
Motor Vehicles		Boats and Boat Gear						
Sale Price	25% thereof	Sale Price	Nelson Bros. 23.5% of Sale Price	Other Sales 28.5% of Sale Price	Equipment charges paid to purchasers in error. Repay to owners	Amount of Claims for Boat Gear Declared & Not Found & Recorded Now Missing	45% of amount in next preceding column	

NETS						
Total award for Nets plus Sale Price	Total Claim for Nets Sold, Declared Not Found and Recorded Now Missing	Percentage Total Award to Total Claim	Claim for Nets Sold Declared Not Found, & Recorded Now Missing	Apply % ratio to Claim	Deduct Custodian Sale Price	

MISCELLANEOUS CHATTELS								
Claim for goods Sold By Auction	Sale Price of Goods Sold By Auction	Rebates of charges 30% of Sale Price	Ratio in % of Sale Price to Claim	Claim for goods Declared Not Found, Recorded Now Missing, & Sold Not Paid	Application of % ratio to amount in next preceding column	Sale Price of goods Sold by Tender	12% of Sale Price	

TOTAL RECOMMENDATION	3035.00

1540

CASE NO: 1041.

JAPANESE PROPERTY CLAIMS COMMISSION

Toronto, Ontario,

May 13, 1948.

IN THE MATTER OF THE CLAIM OF

SHOJI SHIMIZU

PROCEEDINGS AT HEARING.

Original.

CASE NO: 1041.

IN THE MATTER OF THE "INQUIRIES ACT"

PART 1, REVISED STATUTES OF CANADA 1927, CHAPTER 99.

JAPANESE PROPERTY CLAIMS COMMISSION

B E F O R E

(THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE H.I. BIRD, COMMISSIONER).

Toronto, Ontario,

May 13, 1948.

IN THE MATTER OF THE CLAIM OF

SHOJI SHIMIZU

PROCEEDINGS AT HEARING

APPEARANCES:

J.W.G. HUNTER, Esq.,	appearing for the Dominioh Government.
R.A. BEST, Esq.,	appearing for the Claimant.

A. WATSON, Esq.,	Secretary.
MRS. D.J. HANDFORD,	Official Interpreter.
A.G. VEITCH, Esq., C.S.R.,	Official Reporter.

SHOJI SHIMIZU, the Claimant herein, being first duly sworn, testified through the Interpreter as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. BEST:

Q. Is that your signature? A. Yes.

Q. And was that claim form prepared upon your instructions? A. Yes.

(REAL ESTATE, OTHER THAN FARM LAND, MARKED EXHIBIT NO. 1)

Q. Mr. Shimizu, I understand that you are claiming various pieces of real estate in Prince Rupert, the one being a block of stores, including a restaurant and a rooming house over the top at 714 Third Avenue. Is that correct?

A. Yes. That is correct.

Q. And the other claim being for two houses at 720 and 722 Fraser Street, Prince Rupert.

Now, Mr. Shimizu, according to your claim, on No. 1, that is the stores and the rooming house on Third Avenue, there is a note that this was purchased in 1942, bought for taxes for $5,500. Now, was that the first time that you or your family had anything to do with this property?

A. No. My father and partner bought that building, which is an old building, in 1918, $1,865., and land in 1922 was $4,735.

Q. Those figures which you are giving us were figures you understand your father and his partner paid for them back in 1918 and 1922. Is that right?

A. That is right.

Q. Can you explain to us what happened, that apparently you bought the property in 1942 for taxes? A. Well, I had my savings in Prince Rupert. From them I lent to my father $3,000 in 1935 and I have the power to take the property from them.

Q. You mean you made a loan of $3,000 to your father in 1935. You did not take a mortgage on the property, or anything?

A. No; just a mutual understanding I take the - what do you call it - the privilege to take the property.

Q. You actually got a deedfrom the city of Prince Rupert in your name in 1942 for the property?

A. That is right.

Q. In other words, your father, I take it, had defaulted on his taxes so this was a straight-forward tax sale?

A. That is right.

Q. Now, in relation to No. 2, the two houses on Fraser Street, your claim says that these were purchased in 1917 and the land re-purchased in 1941 for taxes. Did exactly the same thing happen there?

A. No. That property was in my name from the beginning.

THE COMMISSIONER: From the beginning?

A. Yes; that is right.

MR. BEST: Q. That is, from 1917?

A. That is right.

Q. Then, surely the city did not sell you back your own property on a tax sale?

A. Well, actually I did not pay the taxes in the depression time, so the city took it and I repurchased it again in 1941.

Q. Are these two houses one building at 720 and 722 Fraser Street? Are they under one roof with a mutual wall or are they two separate houses?

A. They are two separate houses.

Q. You have shown on your claim the assessment as $2,650. Is that just the total of the two? I mean, they would not be assessed ---

A. No. 2?

Q. Yes. How is that assessment broken down, between the two houses, do you know?

THE COMMISSIONER: Were these properties sold separately, referring to No. 720 and 722?

MR. HUNTER: No; they were sold together.

MR. BEST: In that case it does not matter.

THE WITNESS: I could not understand.

MR. BEST: I do not think it matters.

THE COMMISSIONERS: I would like to clear up the question of the first property.

Q. Did you buy the stores and rooming house on Third Avenue at a tax sale?

A. That is right.

Q. What did you pay at the tax sale? A. $5,500.

Q. $5,500? A. Yes.

Q. In 19-- A. In 1942. I have an agreement in here.

MR. HUNTER: January 28, 1942. We have a copy of it here, my lord.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right.

THE WITNESS: Would you like to see the agreement, my lord?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I would, thank you.

MR. HUNTER: It is submitted, my lord, that both these properties were sold for their fair market values.

I tender the appraisal or an abstract from W. H. Shortridge appraisals, made July, 1944, pertaining to the Fraser Street property, the two residences. It is shown here as 718 to 722, although on the real estate statement it is shown as 720 to 722.

"Lot 25 feet by 100 feet, two very old "dwellings, about 1910 to 1912, or so.

"718: Front residence, 21 feet by "31 feet, one storey and attic. Location "close in.

"722: Rear 24 feet by 40 approximately, "two stores; two flats, one each floor.

"718: Five rooms and bathroom, layout "fair, tenant Mr. Gosnell, $16.

"Condition, poor through lack of "maintenance, foundation piles in bad shape, "roof roll sheet, poor, could be made "liveable.

"Plumbing seems to be all right, worst

"bath, kitchen sink, H.W. tank, on sewer.

"722: Duplex, two five-room flats "with bathroom each, one up, one down.

"Condition terrible, built close to "ground and hard to get to foundation, no "maintenance, roof, corrugated, galvanized, "leaks.

"Plumbing seems all right, each, W.C. "bath, sink, H.W. tank.

"Upper tenant McCoy, rent $15, lower, "Perotta, rent $15. Some furniture, not "much account, but each place has kitchen "range connected to tank. 718 has Monarch "range, with oil burner in very good shape, "and small heater in living-room. The "three ranges and oil burner, and heater, "worth maybe $120.

"City assessment $630, improvements "2,020, totalling $2,650.

"Value total $2,830."

I tender that as Exhibit No. 2.

(EXTRACT OF W. H. SHORTRIDGE APPRAISALS, JULY, 1944, MARKED EXHIBIT NO. 2)

That was advertised by Catalogue No. 733. It was sold to the tenant, Mr. Peter Perotta, for $2,900 cash as of August 15, 1944.

THE COMMISSIONER: While we are dealing with that I would like to ask the witness one question?

Q. When you bought the Fraser Street property at the tax sale what was the price paid or agreed to be paid?

A. In 1941 $1,750.

Q. In 1941? A. That is right.

MR. HUNTER: As far as the stores and rooming house are concerned I tender an extract from W. H. Shortridge appraisals, made July, 1944, Catalogue No. 732:

"Pacific Cafe, 714 Third Avenue West, "Prince Rupert.

"Lot, 25 by 100 feet. Building, "approximately 25 feet by 100 feet.

"Front old section, 25 feet by 60 "feet; two-storey frame, built about 1910.

"Rear newer section, 25 feet by 40 "feet; three-storey frame, and basement, "1926.

"Location very good, in hotel section.

"Business - very modern cafe - rooming "house above.

"Rent altogether too low at present, "should get $350 to $400.

"Layout very good, considering age "of building.

"Foundations are in very bad shape, "front part more accessible for repairs, "but rear addition was set on concrete "walls, with no ventilation, just smothered, "and will call for considerable expenditure "to fix.

"This property reverted to the city "during depression, but was redeemed by

"Jap owners for about $5,500.

"General condition run-down, roof needs "attention, many minor jobs to do soon.

"Plumbing, seems to be in fair shape on "the surface. On sewer. Heating, oil electric "hot water seems all right, good boiler. Good-"will well established, cafe equipment very "good, room equipment much of which has been "discarded and stored below.

"Your list accepted by present tenant as "O.K., but much of it he has had to replace. "Tables and chairs in cafe discarded and re-"placed by fixtures by the tenant, who sub-"lets cafe for $200 per month while retaining "the rooms.

"City assessment $2,125.

"Improvements $8,145, totalling $10,270.

"The recent history of reversion makes it "difficult to place a value on this money-"making property as you can imagine, taking "into consideration its condition, but I would "place its value with equipment at $14,500."

THE COMMISSIONER: How was it sold, with equipment?

MR. HUNTER: There is another appraisal, my lord.

(APPRAISAL, EXTRACT OF W.H. SHORTRIDGE APPRAISAL, JULY, 1944, MARKED EXHIBIT NO. 3)

Then, it seems that appraisal was made on a misunderstanding; that is, he was appraising the building and equipment but a lot of this fine new equipment belonged to the tenant so

that he was asked to make a new appraisal, which appraisal is dated July 5, 1944, addressed to the Custodian:

"I received your letter to-day, and made "arrangements to meet the agents of the "above block with Mr. J. Gurvitch, the "tenant, Mr. Tinker was away, but his "manager took up the matter in a most "capable manner and a list of the moneys "expended was drawn up and will be enclosed "herein showing the improvements or expense "incurred in making the place from his "point of view more presentable.

In making my previous survey, I did "not take into consideration the fact that "these improvements would be deductable "to any incoming changes of tenancy, and "would ask that a re-consideration be made "in the valuation, and after reviewing "these facts would place the value as "being lowered by the amount of the account "of the items as expended by Mr. Gurvitch, "which approximates the sum of $3,537.

"I mentioned the matter of depreciation "of these items, but he assures me that "his own time, and other smaller items of "expense have not been taken into con-"sideration in assessing these costs, so "he stood pat on this matter.

"I must also admit, that these items

"have all been carried out as stated, and "in the face of it, must be allowed to "reduce the value previously stated by "the amount he declares he has expended.

"This brings the valuation of this "property to the sum of $11,000.

"Respectfully submitted, William H. "Shortridge.

"P.S. Further to the above, the "equity of Mr. Gurvitch should be protected "by the amount he has expended beyond "reasonable tenant's responsibility, which "his enclosed statement shows is $3,534- "$3,537., making a total value of $14,500."

In other words, if the $3,537. is added to the $11,000, you have approximately $14,500.

I would tender that as Exhibit No. 4.

(APPRAISAL, WILLIAM H. SHORTRIDGE, TO CUSTODIAN, JULY 5, 1944, MARKED EXHIBIT NO. 4)

The thought, upon reading those appraisals, immediately occurred to me, how much of this had become fixtures and how much was equipment which the tenant could have removed, because subject to that I cannot see how he would have been able to take it out with him if he removed any improvements to the actual buildings.

THE COMMISSIONER: I am left to guess what the nature of those improvements were.

MR. HUNTER: I have something here. It is a memorandum dated September 28, 1944, which says:

"The original valuation made by Mr. Short-

"ridge for the real property and equipment "was $14,500.

"This valuation included equipment "which had been installed by the tenant, "Mr. Gurvitch.

"Mr. Shortridge's break-down of his "original valuation of $14,500 is as "follows:

"Real property, $9,700

"Equipment, $4,800

"In response to our request Mr. Short-"ridge later advised that he considered "the improvements which had been made by "Mr. Gurvitch totalled $3,537. Of this "amount the following can be considered as "covering new equipment installed by Mr. "Gurvitch:

"Refrigerator, $325;

"Cooler, Electrical, $646;

"New counters, $250;

"16 stools, $80;

"New furniture for 5 bedrooms, $300;

"Electric fan, $35;

"New booths, $550;

"Linoleum, $225;

"Zinc sink, $100;

"Steam table, $156."

and it is possible, of course, that some of these items may have been considered as fixtures; but the difference between the $3,537 item and this

$2,777, the total of these things I have just read, would appear, as far as I can ascertain, to be improvements in the actual buildings, which I thought actually should have been deducted from the value of the building. I say that without prejudice.

THE COMMISSIONER: We may get a more clear explanation of the situation when the Government defence goes in, in Vancouver.

MR. HUNTER: Yes; when we see the witnesses.

The letter goes on and says:

"The value of the Japanese equipment can "therefore be considered as being "approximately the difference between "the total valuation of $4,800 less "approximately $2,800 on new equipment, "namely $2,000, leaving Mr. Shortridge's "valuation of the Japanese interests as "follows:

"Real property, $9,700

"Equipment, $2,000, totalling $11,700.

"The offer received from Messrs. "Reed, Phitts & Davies and recommended for "acceptance was $12,500. For the purpose "of preparation of documents this can be "divided as follows:

"Real property, $10,500

"Chattels, $2,000."

and it goes on to give some of the terms of the offer.

I tender that as Exhibit No. 5.

(MEMORANDUM, SEPTEMBER 28, 1944, MARKED EXHIBIT NO. 5)

This property was advertised in Catalogue No. 732.

A number of offers were received but it was finally sold as of October 6, 1944, to four Chinese for $10,500. In addition a separate bill of sale was given for the equipment for $2,000.

THE COMMISSIONER: And that, of course, went to the tenant?

MR. HUNTER: No.

THE COMMISSIONER: Let me have those figures again. $10,500 for the land and building, $2,000 for the chattels, equipment.

MR. HUNTER: Yes, my lord. That was as of October 6, 1944.

THE COMMISSIONER: Was that sale passed upon by the Real Property Committee?

MR. HUNTER: I do not see anything to that effect here but I am practically sure it would have been, because it was an automatic thing to refer them to them. Without their approval they just did not go through.

THE COMMISSIONER: I fancy there would have been another Committee in the Rupert area. I do not think it likely that the Committee operating in Vancouver would have had any knowledge of properties in Rupert.

MR. HUNTER: That I cannot say.

It appears to be a question of value. No questions

THE COMMISSIONER: Any re-examination?

MR. BEST: I would like to make my position clear on this situation, so far as the equipment is concerned.

Of course, we do not concede that this tenant was entitled to any compensation for any equipment which could be considered fixtures; in other words, if the property was sold, including the fixtures all of the money should have been paid into the claimant's account.

THE COMMISSIONER: Wait one moment. Was he a tenant put in by the Custodian or a tenant put in by the claimant?

RE-EXAMINATION BY MR. BEST:

Q. Had Gurvitch been in your property before the evacuation? Did you rent the restaurant to Gurvitch? A. Yes. Restaurant and hotel, on a two-year lease, $160 a month.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. To Gurvitch? A. Yes.

Q. Was it a written lease?

A. That is right.

Q. Have you the lease? A. No, I have not got it. What I am claiming now is land and building and about the fixtures and the chattels the claim is by Mr. Nishikazi, in Montreal.

THE COMMISSIONER: That may make for a complication.

MR. BEST: It may. What I wanted to attempt to clarify now was that we here are only claiming

for the building but from the valuations which my friend read it would seem that these appraisers have misconceived their duty to some extent and are attempting to differentiate between what the claimant, as owner of the building, is entitled to and what this tenant is entitled to.

THE COMMISSIONER: That will be a matter for argument later.

I think it would be well to clear up this situation as to Nishikazi's claim.

MR. BEST: Q. You say Mr. Nishikazi in Montreal is going to claim for the business and the fixtures?

A. That is right.

Q. You admit that any fixtures in the building were his and not yours?

A. Fixtures goes with the property, don't they?

Q. Normally things that are attached to the building and cannot be moved go with the building and you should claim for them if they were yours.

THE COMMISSIONER: This situation is going to have to be clarified before I can pass upon it.

Perhaps you had better work it out with the claimant.

MR. BEST: I did not understand that, myself. The only purpose of my bringing it up now is ---

THE COMMISSIONER: I will recess for a short time now and you can have a discussion with your claimant. I want that situation clarified because if there is going to be another claim for chattels or fixtures in Montreal I should know about it now.

MR. BEST: Yes, my lord.

THE COMMISSIONER: We will recess at this point.

---A short recess.

MR. BEST: My lord, it appears that Mr. Shimizu is only claiming for things which are obviously fixtures attached to the building. There is a restaurant sink in the kitchen which he says was there; there is an oil burner which is apparently attached to the restaurant stove and is used for heating purposes. Mr. Shimizu is claiming for that. He says it was installed---

THE COMMISSIONER: I am not concerned with the details of it. He is claiming only for building and such articles as have been installed which are obviously fixtures?

MR. BEST: Yes. That is correct. There is a restaurant counter.

THE COMMISSIONER: Now, I would like to get this other man's name.

MR. BEST: Nishikaze; and he apparently will be claiming for the chattels, the freezer and coffee urns and that type of thing.

THE COMMISSIONER: How does he derive any title?

MR. BEST: Apparently he and this claimant's father operated the restaurant business.

THE COMMISSIONER: I see.

MR. HUNTER: That would be Yasaburo Nishikaze?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. HUNTER: He has a real property claim, as well, my lord. It is No. 31 on the Montreal list.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right. That disposes of this claim?

MR. BEST: Yes, my lord.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right; thank you, Mr. Shimizu, that is all.

PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED SINE DIE

I hereby certify the foregoing to be a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings herein.

A.G. Veitch

"A.G. VEITCH"
Official Reporter.

Case 1041

JAN 14 1948

IN THE MATTER OF a Commission to Investigate Claims of Japanese Canadians for Property Losses.

TO: The Commissioner,
Office of the Custodian,
Royal Bank Bldg.,
Vancouver, B.C.

ACKNOWLEDGED

8894

Pursuant to the notice issued on the 26th day of September, 1947, I submit the following claim:

(1) NAME SHIMIZU SHOJI (RCMP) Reg. No. 10438
(Print) Surname Given Name

(2) Pre-Evacuation Address 714 3rd Ave W. Prince Rupert B.C.

(3) Present Address 361 Huron St. Toronto 5. Ont.

(4) REAL ESTATE (1)

(a) Street Address (if any) 714 3rd Ave. Prince Rupert B.C.
City or Municipality Province
()720-22 Fraser St., Prince Rupert

(b) Legal description (lot number, block number, section number, etc.)
(1) L. 16, B. 23, Sec 1, Map 923
(2) Lot 18, Block 32, Section 1, Map 923

(c) Type of Real Property (cross out words which do not apply):
(i) ~~Farm~~
(ii) Residence (2) &
(iii) Business (1) Type of business
(iv) Any other type of property (describe)

(d) What was your interest in the property (e.g., sole owner, life tenant, joint tenant, owner of one half or one third interest, leasehold, etc.)
Sole owner

(e) Fair market value at date of sale (estimate this to the best of your ability):
(i) Land - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - $
(ii) Buildings - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - $
(iii) If business, put value on business as going concern (including land and buildings, tenancies, chattels, fixtures, stock-in-trade, goodwill and accounts receivable) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - $
(iv) Total value (if you cannot give separate values for lands and buildings just fill in total value) - $ (1)23100.00 (2) 5300.00
(v) Amount at which Custodian sold property and credited your account - - $ (1)10500.00 (2) 2900.00
(f) Loss (This figure is arrived at by deducting item (v) from item (iv) - - - $ 15,000.00

(5) PERSONAL PROPERTY

(a) Place or places at which property was left by the claimant at date of evacuation

(b) Type of premises in which property left (e.g., house, warehouse, garage, shed, church basement, etc.)

(c) How stored or packed at time of evacuation

(over)

(d) In whose care was property left at date of evacuation by the claimant. (This question refers to the terms of reference which exclude claims where the property was lost, destroyed or stolen while under the custody, control or management of any person other than the Custodian appointed by the owner of the property. It involves some definite arrangement whereby you appointed someone to take care of the property and such person accepted the responsibility of so doing. Unless such an arrangement was made the question should be answered "in no one's care") _____

(e) Itemized description of personal property which is the subject of the claim:

1. _____ Estimated Value $_____
2. _____ Estimated Value $_____
3. _____ Estimated Value $_____
4. _____ Estimated Value $_____
5. _____ Estimated Value $_____
6. _____ Estimated Value $_____
7. _____ Estimated Value $_____
8. _____ Estimated Value $_____
9. _____ Estimated Value $_____
10. _____ Estimated Value $_____

TOTAL CLAIM FOR PROPERTY LOSS $_____

N.B.—If you cannot list all the items here prepare a separate list with values set out opposite each item and attach it to the form. The item "personal property" includes shares, bonds, mortgages, loans, notes and all other forms of property not included in real estate.

(f) Total claim including real and personal property (this figure can be arrived at by adding items 4(f) and 5(e) - $ 15,000.00

(6) (a) Place at which claimant prefers to be heard. (Vancouver, Kamloops, Nelson, Lethbridge, Moose Jaw, Winnipeg, Toronto or Montreal.)

Toronto

(b) Do you require the services of an interpreter at the hearing? Yes or no No

N.B.—This Declaration must be sworn before a Commissioner, Notary Public or other person entitled to take declarations. All lawyers are qualified to do so.

DOMINION OF CANADA)
County of York)
TO WIT:)

I, Shoji Shimizu of the City of Toronto in the Province of Ontario

DO SOLEMNLY DECLARE THAT:

The information set out in the form above is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief and I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath, and by virtue of 'The Canada Evidence Act".

DECLARED before me at the City of Toronto in the County of York this 10th day of January A.D. 1947.

Shoji Shimizu

R A Best.

A Commissioner &c.

N.B. — THIS FORM FULLY COMPLETED AND SWORN BEFORE A COMMISSIONER SHOULD BE MAILED BY REGISTERED MAIL TO THE COMMISSIONER, c/o THE OFFICE OF THE CUSTODIAN, ROYAL BANK BLDG., VANCOUVER, B.C., BEFORE NOVEMBER 30th, 1947. IF YOU CANNOT MAIL IT BEFORE THIS DATE SET OUT BELOW REASONS FOR THE DELAY.

_____

Shimizu, Shoji
(Claimant's Name)

REAL ESTATE
(Other than farm)

10438
Reg. No.

Type of Premises (e.g. House, Store, etc.)	No. of Rooms	Type of Finish	Use of Premises	Size of Lot	When Purchased	Date of Purchase
(1) Stores and Rooming House 714 3rd Ave., Prince Rupert.	1 Restaurant & 30rooms (a) 12 rooms. (b) 5 rooms.	Frame Shingle & Siding	Restaurant & rooming.	25 x 100	1942	28 Jan./4
(2) 720-22 Fraser St. Prince Rupert. 2 Houses.		(a) Frame siding (b) Frame siding	Dwellings	25 x 100	(a) (b) 1917 and land repurchased 1941 for taxes.	

Type of Locality	Cost Price	Improvements made by Claimant	Estimated Value	Date of Sale
(1) Business district	$5500. Bought for taxes.	Hot water heating in 1924 costing $4,800.00	$23,100.	
(2) Residential	$6865. for house & land only. Repurchased whole for $1750. for taxes.	Built small house in 1924. Cost--$3500. Remodelling of two rooms in 1941 costing $250.00	$ 5,300.	

Comments re upkeep of premises:

(1) Claimant and family had been tenants and former owners in building and did the best to keep it in good ~~condition~~ repair.

(2) Newer building is in good condition although older one was poor.

Comments re Appraiser's report not covered above: (1) Claimant's father formerly owned building and paid $16,500. to build rear portion of building in 1924. Excellent business location---Valuators remarks about rental value of $350.-$400. per month are true. On a capitalization basis this would confirm my valuation.
$160. per month lease was an emergency measure only.

(2) Total rent $4600. Assessment $2650. On income basis valuation is justified.

EXHIBIT No. 1041-1
DATE 13 May 1948
FILED BY R. A. Best.

Shoji Shimizu
Signature

1041 - 2
EXHIBIT No.
13 May, 1948.
DATE
FILED BY
J.W.G. Hunter.

EXTRACT OF W. H. SHORTRIDGE APPRAISALS
MADE JULY, 1944.

733, Lot 18; 32; 1. 718 - 722 Fraser St., Prince Rupert, B.C.

Lot 25' x 100' 2 very old dwellings, about 1910-12, or so.
718: Front res., 21' x 33' 1 story & attic. Location close in.
722: Rear 24' x 40' app., 2 story; 2 flats, 1 ea. floor.
718: 5 rooms & bathroom, layout fair, Tenant Mr. Gosnell $16.00.
Condition, poor through lack of maintainance, fdn. piles in bad shape, roof roll sheet, poor, could be made livable.

Plumbing seems to be alright, W.C. bath, kn. sink, HW Tank, on sewer.

722: duplex - 2-5 room flats with bathroom each 1 up, 1 down.

Condition terrible, built close to ground, and hard to get to foundation, no maintainance, roof corr. gald., leaks.

Plumbing seems alright, each, W.C. bath, sink HW tank.

Upper tenant, McCoy, rent 15.00 lower Perotta rent 15.00
Some furniture, not much account, but each place has kitchen range and connected to tank. 718 has Monarch range, with Gil burner in very good shape, and small heater in living room. The 3 ranges and Oil burner, and heater worth maybe $120.00.

City Assd.	630.00	
Imps.	2020.00	
		Value total $2830.00.
	2650.00	
		Value Twenty-eight hundred thirty.

I certify the above statement to be correct.

Date: July 5, 1948.

E. La Casse

EXHIBIT No. 1041 - 3
DATE 13 May, 1948.
FILED BY J.W.G. Hunter.

EXTRACT OF W. H. SHORTRIDGE APPRAISALS
MADE JULY, 1944.

732, 16; 23; 1. Pacific Cafe - 714 Third Ave, W., Prince Rupert.

Lot - 25' x 100'. Building app. 25' x 100'.
Front Old Section, 25' x 60'; 2 story Frame, built about 1910.
Rear Newer " 25' x 40'; 3 " Frame, & Basement 1926.
Location Very Good, in Hotel section.
Business - Very Modern Cafe - Rooming House above.
Rent altogether too low at present, should be 350 - 400.00.
Layout very good, considering age of building.
Foundations are in very bad shape, Front part more accessable for repairs, but rear addition was set on concrete walls, and with no ventilation, just smothered, and will call for considerable expenditure, to fix.

(This property reverted to the City during depression, but was redeemed by Jap owners for about 5500.00).

General condition run down, roof needs attention, many minor jobs to do soon.

Plumbing, seems to be in fair shape on the surface. On sewer.
Heating, Oil Electric Hot Water seems alright, Good boiler.
Goodwill well established, Cafe equipment very good, room equipment much of which has been discarded and stored below.
Your list accepted by present tenant as OK, but much of it he has had to replace. Tables and chairs in cafe discarded and replaced with fixtures, by tenant, who sublets Cafe for $200.00 per MO., while retaining the rooms.

City Assd.	2125.00
Imps.	8145.00
	10270.00

The recent history of revertion makes it difficult to place a value on this money making property as you can imagine, taking into consideration its condition, but I would place its Value with equipment at $14500.00.

Value Fourteen thousand five hundred dollars.

I certify the above statement to be correct.

Date: July 5, 1948.

E. LaCasse
6 H.

EXHIBIT No.
DATE
FILED BY

13 May, 1948.

J.W.G. Hunter.

Box 513,
Prince Rupert, B.C.

July 5th, 1944.

F.G. Shears Esq.,
Director, Department Jpanese Evacuation Section.
Vancouver, B. C.

Dear Sir:-

Re Catalogue No. 732,
714 West Third Ave.,
Prince Rupert, B. C.

I received your letter to-day, and made arrangements to meet the Agents of the above block with Mr. J. Gurvitch the tenant Mr. Tinker was away, but his Manager took up the matter in a most capable manner and a list of the moneys expended was drawn up (and will be enclosed herein) showing improvements or expense occurred in making the place, from his point of view more presentable.

In making my previous survey, I did not take into consideration the fact that these improvements would be deductable to any incoming changes of tenancy, and would ask that a reconsideration be made in the valuation, and after reviewing these facts would place the value as being lowered by the amount of the account of the items as expended by Mr. Gurvitch, which approximates the sum of $ 3537.00.

I mentioned the matter of depreciation of these items, but he assures me that his own time, and other smaller items of expense have not been taken into consideration in assessing these costs, so he stood pat on this matter.

I must also admit, that these items have all been carried out as stated, and in the face of its, must be allowed to reduce the value previously stated by the amount he declares he has expended.

This brings the valuation of this property to the sum of Eleven Thousand dollars. - $ 11,000.00.

Respectfully submitted.

"Wm. H. Shortridge"

Wm H. Shortridge.

2 Enclosures,
Reports from G.P. Tinker & Co. Ltd.
in duplicate.

P.S. "Further to the above, the equity of Mr. Gurvitch should be protected by the amount he has expended beyond reasonable tentants responsibility, which as his enclosed statement shows is $3537.00.- Thirty five hundred thirty seven dollars.
Making a total value of $14,500.00.
Fourteen Thousand five hundred dollars. "

"Wm. Shortridge"

I hereby certify that the foregoing words are a true copy of the original whereof they purport to be a copy.
Date: July 5, 1948.

E. L. Cassel

6/6.

File No. 8894.

1041 - 5.

EXHIBIT No.

DATE 13 May , 1948.

FILED BY

J.W.G. Hunter.

28th September, 1944.

MEMORANDUM

To: THE FILE

From : Mr. F. G. Shears

Re: Catalogue No. 732
714 West 3rd Avenue
16/23/1/923 - Prince Rupert.

The original valuation made by Mr. Shortridge for the real property and equipment was $14,500.00.

This valuation included equipment which had been installed by the tenant, Mr. Gurvich.

Mr. Shortridge's breakdown of his original valuation of $14,500.00 is as follows:

Real Property	$9,700.00
Equipment	4,800.00

In response to our request Mr. Shortridge later advised that he considered the improvements which had been made by Mr. Gurvich totalled $3,537.00. Of this amount the following can be considered as covering new equipment installed by Mr. Gurvich:

Refrigerator	$325.00
Cooler, electrical	646.00
New counters	250.00
16 stools	80.00
New furniture for five bedrooms	300.00
Electric fan	85.00
New booths	550.00
Linoleum	285.00
Zinc sink	100.00
Steam table	156.00
	$ 2,777.00

The value of the Japanese equipment can therefore be considered as being approximately the difference between the total valuation of $4,800.00 less approximately $2,800.00 on new equipment, namely $2,000.00, leaving Mr. Shortridge's valuation of the Japanese interest as follows:

Real property	$9,700.00
equipment	2,000.00
	$ 11,700.00

The offer received from Messrs. Reed, Phipps & Davies and recommended for acceptances was $12,500.00. For the purpose of preparation of documents this can be divided as follows:

Real property	$ 10,500.00
Chattels	2,000.00

The terms of the offer are $6,250.00 cash which can be applied $2,000.00 in full payment of chattels and $4,250.00 as an initial payment on the real property, leaving a balance of $6,250.00 on the real property to be paid in quarterly payments over two years at 5% interest.

"F.G. Shears"

F. G. Shears,
Director.

FGS/PH

I hereby certify that the foregoing words are a true copy of the original whereof they purport to be a copy.
Date: July 5, 1948.

E. W. Casse
L.M.