RECORD GROUP /ol. No. VOLUME Soldier S FILE V-8-14 CROSS REFERENCES SUBJECT OR NAME (OFFICIAL NO.) SUB-SUBJECT. LAND DESCRIPTION_ OFFICE_ THIS COVER MUST NOT BE FOLDED UNDER FILE (6) (2) (4) (5) (1) ENTER DATE TO BRING FOR-WARD WHEN REQUIRED USER'S INITIAL TO SHOW ACTION DATE RETURNED TO PURPOSE FOR WHICH REFERRED DATE LEFT CENTRAL RECORDS (IF PURPOSE FOR WHICH REFERRED CANNOT BE REFER FILE TO EXPRESSED IN ONE LINE ADD MEMO TO FILE CENTRAL COMPLETED AND ENTER HERE "WITH MEMO". RECORDS Account No. OF EXPENDITU

PLEASE QUOTE FILE Gen. 16

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT OF CANADA and Veterans' Land Act

Attention Ass't. Superintendent, Land and Loans Branch 518 Rogers Bldg., Vancouver, B.C., Sept. 29, 1943.

The Director of Soldier Settlement and Veterans' Land Act, OTTAWA. Canada.

Re: VLA 22 - Project Accounts

I am in receipt of your letter of the 21st with regard to preparation of the above form in connection with purchase of former Japanese lands.

It is not recalled if the matter of acreage and form of security received attention during our discussion. However, we will as requested complete these details in future. I may say that the form is made up from the official list covering purchase of the various properties, which, however, does not contain the acreage in each case, and it will be necessary to refer to other records in this connection. You also request that we indicate the name of the former occupant as your copy of the appraisals have been filed alphabetically. We will follow this practice in completing the balance of the forms. As it was understood that it was not considered desirable to perpetuate the Japanese name we have as far as possible avoided the use of the same as long as there was no likelihood of any confusion arising.

Dealing with the Konno properties you have returned two appraisals, to which I find attached our letter to you of August the 11th, 1942, enclosing a new Sheet 1 for one of the reports as some mix-up had occurred when the Supervisor completed the report. It might appear that the wrong copy was destroyed in your office. However, we are returning the reports with a fresh Sheet 1 in the case of Lot 3, and the reports as they now stand are correct. I may say that as far as Lots 4 and 5 are concerned, no VLA 22 has been issued for the reason that there would seem to be little likelihood of the Director acquiring these lots owing to either heavy encumbrance or some difficulty of title.

9.) Barret

District Superintendent

HRH/VP

Ottawa, September 21st, 1943.

District Superintendent - VANCOUVER.

Re:- V.L.A.22 - Project Accounts.

I have for acknowledgment your letter of September 15th, headed as above.

The forms submitted have been prepared in general conformity with the understanding reached while I was in Vancouver, as outlined by you, but in reviewing them two points have been observed which I am not sure whether we discussed or not.

- (1) In many instances the acreage is not stated. I believe that inclusion of the acreage should be an invariable rule.
- (2) In the section headed "Form of Security and Documents Required" I think it would be good practice to insert the word "title". This may seem to you superfluous and a waste of time because it is almost obvious that where we are advancing money to buy land the security we would hold would be clear title to such land but this practice would make and keep the record clear and I believe it should be followed.

One other point arises that I know was not discussed when I was in Vancouver. I refer to the advisability of indicating on Forms V.L.A.22 covering the purchase of these Japanese lands the name of the former occupant. The appraisals covering these lands which we hold here at Ottawa have been filed alphabetically and it would greatly facilitate our work in locating the appropriate appraisal if the name of the Japanese owner is given to us.

I have been able to tie in all the Forms V.L.A.22 with the appropriate appraisals except in one instance, that of Y. Konno (JL-27) BC/247P, Lot 3 of NW1 of SW1, Section 28, Township 17, Map 5659, N.W.D. I find two appraisals here relating to this man, one submitted May 6th and one August 11th. I attach hereto the reports in question from which you will be able to appreciate my difficulty. One report covering 9.49 acres (Lot 3) values the property at \$759.50. The other report covering Lots 4 and 5, with an acreage of 9.68, shows the value as \$969.50.

Encs.

(OVER)

According to Approval of Expenditure, we have bought Lot 3 at a cost of \$210.00.

I should be glad if you would see what you could do to straighten out the mix-up that has occurred in connection with these appraisals and let me have a copy of the appraisal covering the land that has been purchased.

Assistant Superintendent, Land and Loans Branch.