

*Mr. Shimizu  
Hyodo  
Shimizu  
Rogin or Jack  
Muriel*

TO THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

On Wednesday, June 29th, this writer spoke over the telephone in reply to a call made to this office by K. Hidaka with respect to certain matters discussed at the last National Executive Committee meeting held on June 14 when a report submitted by K. Hidaka as Chairman of the sub-Committee on Finance was heard by the Executive Committee. It was pursuant to the submission of this report and matters pertaining to discussions by the Executive Committee on this report and certain decisions arrived at by the Executive Committee which prompted K. Hidaka as Chairman of the sub-Committee to phone this office on the aforesaid date. Previous to this call, K. Hidaka requested on several occasions of the Office Secretary for the names of the organizations which had made financial donation to the National JCCA and persons in whose name these donations were made. The Office Secretary withheld giving this information as it appeared to her that the Chairman of the Finance Committee intended to write immediately to these people with regard to their possible appointment as Trustees who would have jurisdiction over the National JCCA Trust Fund. K. Hidaka had no authorization to carry out his intentions as outlined.

*cannot begin  
writing until  
with intention*

On June 29th, the Office Secretary referred a phone call she received from K. Hidaka to this writer. Mr. Hidaka, upon inquiry by this writer as to the reason for his call, stated that he desired the names of the organizations whose funds had been donated to the National JCCA and the names and addresses of the persons responsible for making the donations. The writer was also informed by Mr. Hidaka that it was his intention to write to these aforementioned people for the ultimate purpose of setting up the trustees who would have jurisdiction over the National JCCA Trust Funds. This writer informed Mr. Hidaka that it was his knowledge that the National Executive Committee had not yet decided on any action to contact the persons aforementioned responsible for donating funds to the National JCCA Trust Fund and it was his knowledge that the National Executive Committee had actually arrived only at the decision to set up a Trust Fund and had not gone any further than that point. Furthermore, the writer stated to Mr. Hidaka that all National JCCA administrative responsibilities including writing to the aforementioned donors, should that be the desire of the Executive Committee, was the responsibility of the National Office.

*no  
letter*

This writer wishes to state that, the discussion developed into time-wasting argument which this writer terminated abruptly. Furthermore, this writer refused to continue the discussion over the telephone with Mr. Hidaka. This writer wishes to submit to this meeting that the above-stated incident has brought to a head an intolerable situation of long-standing nature. The actions of Mr. Hidaka ever since his presence on the Committee have tended to disrupt the smooth operation of the National Office and has placed unnecessary handicap on this writer and the Office Secretary. This writer wishes to state to this meeting that it is impossible for him to place any trust in Mr. Hidaka as a member of the National Executive Committee.

1. The basic complaint of this writer on the following stated matters is that Mr. Hidaka has totally disregarded the advice of this writer by prolonged argumentative discourse opposing this writer's statements.

This writer makes the following charges with respect to his complaint (As the aforementioned incident of June 29th precipitated a long-standing situation which now can no longer be tolerated by this writer, it will be dealt with first.):

- (a) The National Executive Committee, at their meeting held June 14th, 1949, arrived at the decision to set up a Trust Fund, and had not arrived at any decision to contact persons responsible for making contributions to the Trust Fund, contrary to Mr. Hidaka's claim.
- (b) All the administrative responsibilities of the National JCCA are entrusted with the National Executive Secretary which includes the writing of correspondence.

*This is  
not stated  
in Court*

Had it not been for this writer being very strict with Mr. Hidaka, he would have carried out actions which would have been contrary to the points (a) and (b). In the telephone conversation held on June 29th, Mr. Hidaka stated that it was his responsibility to write to the persons who donated funds to the National JCCA Trust Fund with the ultimate object, presumably, of setting up a Trusteeship. It is the opinion of this writer that if this action had been carried out by Mr. Hidaka, it would have been a totally unauthorized action which would therefore be contrary to the wishes of the National Executive Committee.

*did not state that I  
would write to  
members -*

Mr. Hidaka, in intending to take the responsibility of writing to the aforementioned people is totally disregarding this writer's responsibilities as the National Executive Secretary who, by the general consent of the Executive Committee and by the Constitution, is entrusted with the administrative responsibilities of the National organization.

2. The basic complaint of this writer on the following stated points is that it has been indicated very clearly to this writer by the actions of Mr. Hidaka that he has no regard for this writer's responsibilities and through his actions, has failed to extend to this writer any measure of co-operation as a member of the National Executive Committee.

Mr. Hidaka, as Chairman of the Finance sub-Committee, during the period of his tenure in that office, has exhibited to this writer an attitude of non-cooperation and total disregard of the position of responsibility of the National Executive Secretary with his relationship to all sub-committees so that when meetings are called of the Finance sub-Committee, Mr. Hidaka has failed to inform this writer of such meetings. The following points illustrate this matter:

- (a) A few minutes after the termination of the National Executive Committee meeting held on May 17, this writer intimated to Mr. Hidaka that he would be willing to attend meetings of the Finance sub-Committee when they are called. (It has always been the understanding of this writer that where he is not officially appointed as a member of any Committee, he nevertheless is in effect appointed to act in an ex-officio capacity.) The evasive answer which this writer received from Mr. Hidaka at this time gave the first indication of the attitude Mr. Hidaka might take with regard to himself. This attitude, in the opinion of the writer, has been fostered by Mr. Hidaka to such an extent that no notification of the sub-Committee meeting held on Sunday, June 26, 1949, was given to him.
  - (b) Furthermore, when the first of the sub-committee meetings was held, there was no notification given to this writer of the meeting despite the fact that the Office Secretary had mentioned to Mr. Hidaka whether he had invited the Executive Secretary to this meeting.
3. The basic complaint of this writer with respect to the following stated matters is that Mr. Hidaka by his actions has indicated a total disregard of his responsibilities to the Ontario JCCA sub-Committee which employed him as interpreter for the claims hearings held in Toronto.

Mr. Hidaka's actions, which were brought to the attention of this writer by Mr. Ken Hori, Past President of the Ontario JCCA, during the time of the sub-Commission Claims hearings held in Toronto, have indicated an undesirable quality which is foreign to all JCCA workers and executives throughout the country, in the opinion of this writer:

Mr. Hidaka was appointed last fall by the Ontario JCCA sub-Committee on Claims headed by Mr. Ken Hori, to act in the capacity of interpreter at the sub-Commission Hearings in Toronto. This appointment was made through the Ontario Chapter of the JCCA with Mr. Hidaka on the basis that he would be paid at the rate of \$10.00 per day. Mr. Hidaka accepted this work on that basis. Subsequently he approached the Ontario JCCA sub-Committee and Mr. Hori stating that he desired to be paid more than \$10.00 per day for this work. But the Ontario JCCA did not sanction a further increase of pay for Mr. Hidaka.

This writer is conversant with the situation at that time as he was approached by Mr. Hori with regard to the request by Mr. Hidaka for an increase in pay. When this writer discussed this matter with Mr. Hori at that time, it was felt that the JCCA could not increase Mr. Hidaka's pay as the granting of such an increase would be unfair to the JCCA workers in the other Provinces who had given their time acting as interpreters, etc., at a rate of pay which did not exceed \$10.00 per day.

This writer informed Mr. Hori that if Mr. Hidaka was given an increase in pay, it would be necessary also to increase the pay of Mr. Okuda in Montreal who was paid \$10.00 a day for assisting claimants in acting as interpreter and filling out claimants forms, especially so, in view of the fact that Mr. Okuda not only worked a full day in this capacity but also worked every night long hours assisting claimants, and it was the opinion of this writer that Mr. Okuda deserved a much higher pay than he was given. Likewise, in British Columbia, where this writer was informed by the B. C. JCCA executive and its

President, Mr. Seiji Homma, that their JCCA executives were paid only \$8.00 per day working in the capacity of interpreters and assisting claimants in filling out forms. It was stated to this writer by the B. C. JCCA executives that these executive members were accepting \$8.00 per day in a spirit of true JCCA co-operation and sacrifice despite the fact that they felt that their work was worth a greater rate of pay.

Under these circumstances, it was felt that it would not be fair to give Mr. Hidaka a higher rate of pay when other JCCA workers throughout the country deserved a like consideration. And if Mr. Hidaka was to be given a rate of pay higher than the \$10.00 per day, that the same treatment should be accorded the other JCCA members who carried out work in a like capacity.

Subsequent to this incident, a month or two later, this writer was informed that Mr. Hidaka disregarded his responsibilities to the Ontario JCCA Claims sub-Committee which had employed him and asked Mr. Brewin for an increase in pay. This writer spoke to Mr. Brewin regarding this matter and Mr. Brewin professed ignorance to the fact that Mr. Hidaka was responsible to the Ontario JCCA who had hired him and had consented to Mr. Hidaka's request for an increase in pay.

When this writer questioned Mr. Brewin on this matter, Mr. Brewin said that he promised to pay \$10.00 per day to Mr. Hidaka out of the Co-operative Committee Claims Fund when the awards are paid by the Government to claimants. His reasons for doing this were that Mr. Hidaka had been able to give him some advice on economic matters and also had spent considerable time during the day on calling on claimants notifying them of their hearings when they failed to make an appearance.

This writer fails to reconcile the fact that Mr. Hidaka will be paid in the end for his services at the rate of \$20.00 per day despite the decision of the JCCA to the contrary.

4. With regard to the following stated matters, this writer has two basic complaints to make: (a) that he failed to render satisfactory service to the National JCCA proportionate to the sum of \$250.00 he was paid to carry out his responsibilities; (b) that his actions of submitting a greatly increased bill to the National Executive Committee in the face of his failure to carry out his assignment is contrary to the spirit which is expected from JCCA members.

In the spring of 1948, Mr. Hidaka was authorized to prepare a Brief on Property Losses Claims to be submitted to the Commission. The sum agreed upon between Mr. Hidaka and the National Executive Committee for his services in preparing the Brief was for \$150.00 to \$250.00. Mr. Hidaka submitted a Brief which in fact was entirely unsatisfactory to the National Executive Committee as it was not in completed form ready for submission to the Commission. It was necessary for a second Claims Brief sub-committee, chaired by this writer, to take over the responsibility of completing this Brief in a finished satisfactory form. It was the opinion of this writer and the sub-Committee that the Brief was entirely unsatisfactory in the form it was submitted by Mr. Hidaka as much of it was poorly written and included a number of grammatical errors. Subsequent to the Second National Conference when the Brief as originally submitted by Mr. Hidaka was studied, the Conference delegates recommended that the Brief be revised, especially the introductory portion which was considered to be too lengthy. Mr. Hidaka was requested by the National Executive Committee to do this. Upon the submission of the revised Brief by Mr. Hidaka, the Claims Brief sub-Committee found no material difference in the Brief. In fact, the introductory portion was still lengthy and appeared not to have been shortened to any degree whatsoever. This writer, as Chairman of the aforementioned sub-Committee, appealed to Mr. Tom Shoyama and Mr. George Tamaki for assistance in rewriting the Brief in a more satisfactory finished form. Mr. Shoyama and Mr. Tamaki were kind enough to give a great deal of their time voluntarily to carry out this work.

Before the Brief was finally completed and submitted to the Commission, Mr. Hidaka requested payment from the National Executive Committee on a bill for services rendered greatly increased to that which was initially agreed upon. He submitted a bill for \$475.00. However, the National Executive Committee refused to pay Mr. Hidaka this increased sum which was certainly not agreed upon and payment was made to him for the sum of \$250.00 for an incomplete Brief.

It is the opinion of this writer that Mr. Hidaka was overpaid because he submitted a Brief which was poorly written and under no circumstances could have been

submitted to the Commission. Furthermore, it is pointed out that it required Mr. Shoyama and Mr. Tamaki to spend a considerable amount of voluntary time re-writing the Brief, as well as the time of the sub-committee chaired by this writer, before the Brief was completed in its final form.

5. The basic complaint that this writer makes with respect to the following stated matter is that Mr. Hidaka has from the beginning of his tenure of office as a new member of the Executive Committee, exhibited to this writer and subsequently to the Office Secretary, in an increasing measure, an antagonistic attitude which has been a disrupting influence against the operation of the office and has forced upon the Office Secretary, as well as this writer, tension which has become absolutely intolerable. In the case of the Office Secretary, it has forced her to resign her position as a member of the National Executive Committee.

When this writer approached the National Executive Committee for an increase in salary for the Office Secretary in December, 1948, and subsequently in the early part of 1949, giving as his reasons the fact that the Office Secretary's pay was inadequate to her immediate living needs and, over-and-above that reason, that her capabilities and work, in the opinion of this writer, was worth far more than she was receiving; furthermore, this writer stated to the Committee in recommending that the Office Secretary's pay be raised retroactive to November, 1948, that she had during the fall and winter months (at the time the statement was made in December), worked long hours each week far exceeding that which she was required to do in her capacity as Office Secretary. This writer stated to the Executive Committee meetings that often she was required to work during the extremely busy fall months of 1948, fifty to seventy hours per week. Also, that during the early months of 1949, she was required to work long hours which certainly varied over the usual 40-hrs. per week which is the usual office standard required of Office Secretaries. This writer also informed the National Executive Committee that the Office Secretary was a member of the Office Workers' Union and according to Mr. Ken Woodsworth, Executive Secretary of the Union, Office Secretary's required to carry out the duties as outlined by this writer should be paid a minimum of \$40.00 per week. While this writer did not recommend that the Office Secretary be paid as high as the Union rate, although it is without doubt a responsibility of the organization to observe Union rates of pay, and due to the kindness of the Office Secretary not to request the Union rate of pay, this writer only requested an increase of approximately \$6.00 per week to the approximate weekly rate of \$30.00.

During the lengthy period when the Executive Committee considered this writer's request of raising the Office Secretary's salary, Mr. Hidaka had on several occasions insinuated directly to the face of the Office Secretary that she is not worth the increase requested by this writer. Furthermore, Mr. Hidaka has stated outside the Executive Committee to Mr. Woodsworth that he was dissatisfied with the way the National organization was functioning and was against allowing an increase in the Office Secretary's salary.

6. This writer's basic complaint to the following stated matter is that Mr. Hidaka as a member of the National Executive Committee: (a) completely repudiated his position on the Committee by ignoring his responsibilities to the Committee, (b) his actions in speaking as he did before the claimants indicates that he totally disregards the fundamental democratic principle by which the JCCA and the National Executive Committee function where decisions are arrived at by majority vote. (c) in his statement to the claimants that amongst the seven members of the National Executive Committee who voted in favour of endorsing the Co-operative Committee's recommendation he believed only one was a claimant, indicates that he has no respect for the integrity of the National Executive Committee. (d) it is this writer's opinion that Mr. Hidaka, in exhibiting this tendency of irresponsibility as a member of the National Executive Committee, may have contributed to the undermining of the confidence of some claimants in Toronto in the National Executive Committee and the National organization.

On Sunday, May 29th, 1949, there was held in Toronto the first Claimants meeting called to consider the Co-operative Committee's recommendation to claimants with respect to the Commissioner's Proposal for Settlement. At this meeting, this writer reported as he has done across the country on the Claims Proposal and the recommendation of the Co-operative Committee. It has been the policy of the writer in advising the Provincial JCCA Chapter executives, to refrain from informing claimants at Claimants meetings of the decision of the National JCCA in endorsing the Co-operative Committee's recommendations to Claimants for the acceptance of the Commissioner's Proposals for settlement, as this writer felt that the claimants should not be influenced by the JCCA's endorsement in coming to a decision as to acceptance or rejection of the offer of the Commissioner's proposal. However, this

writer had informed the JCCA executive members throughout the country that should they be asked by claimants to give advice as to what the JCCA felt regarding the proposal and the Co-operative Committee's recommendations for acceptance, that they might then inform the claimants of the National JCCA's decision of endorsement.

At the Toronto Claimants meeting above-stated, after this writer spoke to the claimants and during the discussion period, Mr. Hidaka stood up at the meeting and spoke to the claimants stating that he had voted against endorsement of the Co-operative Committee recommendation and he further stated to the claimants that in his opinion there was not more than one person who was a claimant among the seven National Executive Committee members who voted in favour of endorsement of the Co-operative Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Hidaka should realize as a Committee member that members of the National Executive Committee, when studying any question that confronts the Committee, whether such questions, as in the case of the Claims question, directly concerns them as claimants or not, in arriving at any decision, do so conscientiously with careful consideration of all points. Mr. Hidaka loses sight of the very important fact that each member of the Executive Committee in accepting a position on the Committee fully appreciates the responsibilities with which the Committee is entrusted in its work of considering the various important matters which come to its attention.

This writer therefore submits to the National Executive Committee, upon the basis of the above-stated complaints, that he will not tolerate further to be placed in any position of association with Mr. Hidaka to the minimum degree of the latter being placed as Chairman of any sub-Committee.

This writer further submits that a continuation of the present intolerable situation can only continue to foster a disruptive influence against the functioning of the National Office.

Signed: GEORGE TANAKA,  
National Executive Secretary.

July 12, 1949.