EAST OF GORE

A HISTORY OF THE CHRIST CHURCH OF CHINA AND SURROUNDING DISTRICT DURING FEDERAL RENEWAL EFFORTS IN THE 1960s

This report will cover a brief history of the church, followed by the organization's response to state intervention amidst the largest public housing project in Vancouver's history. It will encompass Project 1 and Project 2, technical terms that simply refer to two public housing phases in the project bordered by Union, Jackson, Pender, and Gore street. The report refers to two principal addresses: the church's original address at 340 Keefer and their current address at 300 East Pender. Throughout the report, the history of Chinese treatment in Vancouver and its connections to federal policies will be evaluated alongside the city's actions in an impartial way. Determining whether the social housing project was a net negative or positive with regards to planning is outside the scope of this report. The goal of this research was solely to determine whether the city's actions had a negative effect on the Chinese community in the area; and whether the city acted with explicit intent to limit Chinese economic and social activity. References for the report include the city's own correspondence, archival newspaper records, and fire insurance maps. Evaluation of general Chinese social history will be made through primary sources as well as through the City of Vancouver's 2018 apology, the most current official admission of wrongs made by the municipal government.

The 111-year-old Christ Church of China (hereafter referred to as CCOC) has witnessed immigration waves and the committed establishment of the Chinese community in the area now recognized as Strathcona. The position it took in the city's urban renewal program during the 1960s drew public scrutiny to the city's intentions, catalyzing government actions on recognizing the legitimacy of the Chinese community's claims. This long dispute culminated in the church being the only relocated property within the entire Project 2 renewal scheme, operating today at 300 East Pender Street. Project 2 was a second phase of a federally sponsored sprawling Mid-Century urban planning process that would overhaul the neighbourhood's existing mixed use of commercial, residential, and cultural land uses (Vancouver Real Estate Services). If it had been completed, Project 2 and its following phases would have been one of the largest state intervention housing projects in Canada's history. Without the CCOC's dedicated legal and press fight, there would be little record on how the city and federal government exercised their expropriation measures and their actions when confronted with resistance. The importance of the church's position is also vital in contextualizing the surrounding district and how the Chinese immigrants perceived ownership of this "space" (the Strathcona neighbourhood) was strengthened by challenging state policies during this time.

CHURCH HISTORY AND CONTEXT

Serving the community since 1913, the CCOC occupied a small lot at 340 Keefer Street as the first independent Chinese Catholic Church in Canada. The building, constructed in 1900, became the new home of the Church in 1920 after leaving its original site at Main and Pender. Their congregation was founded by around 15 Chinese of various religious denominations, all of whom were recent immigrants to the city. A confectionery sold goods on the western corner at 300 Keefer, while Sum Hong Kee's grocery operated at 322 Keefer. Other early settlers included the prominent Wong Tsung Gip, born in Canton China, who came to British Columbia in 1906. He established the Hip Sang Co. enterprise at 336 Keefer, selling wholesale fruits and vegetables. Directly to the west was the CCOC, occupying the structure at 340 Keefer. The block hosted numerous Chinese cultural celebrations, with the church and Hip Sang Co. hosting festivities. Chinese New Year celebrations occurred at the Hip Sang building, with Mr. Gip himself

and his children, born into the business, organizing the procession. In 1941, Mr. Gip, held a triple wedding for his three sons, Chong, 20, Banford, 26, and Benson, 22, all married under the influence of “everything from bird’s nest soup” to “good, mellow scotch whisky” (The Vancouver Sun, 1941). With the passage of the Chinese Exclusion Act in 1923, and the influence of the prior head tax, Chinese men separated from wives back home sought safety and further fastened ownership in the area through land improvements. The Chinese population also faced social stigmatization from local authorities, specifically the Vancouver Police Department**.** A notable example was a scandal in the 1930s occurred when Chinese men were prosecuted for gambling practices, even though these operations present little harm to society beyond the Chinese population. The police chief even wrote a letter in 1933 to acting mayor Miller requesting that the department divert their attention to more pressing matters (Vancouver Board of Police Commissioners). The criminalization of Chinese social practices reinforced discrimination at a federal level and increased distrust between Chinese immigrants and the City during the late 19th to mid 20th century.

Land improvement additions stemming from the Exclusion Act were eclectic; units were added with new concrete basements, commercial businesses fixed up storefronts, and the Christ Church of China had a concrete façade erected in 1955. Basements of dwellings were at times even interconnected, with one property having a basement spanning 2,817 square feet below two adjacent homes (Vancouver Real Estate Services). The ingraining of social identity in the area’s during the 1950s reinforced the presence of Chinese community beyond initial settlement in the area for industrial employment during the 1910s. The reconfiguration of the church is a testament to how the community was being molded by increased immigration demands which in turn strengthened Chinese perception of ownership and spatial identity in the area.

EARLY REDEVELOPMENT HISTORY

The church found itself amid a comprehensive multi government renewal scheme for the entire district in the 1940s. The project would involve the relocation of thousands of residents from what the city reports called dilapidated slum dwellings to newly constructed modernist towers and townhomes and was a joint Federal and Municipal effort. (Vancouver Real Estate Services). Until the 1950s, Vancouver’s urban planning policy had been restricted to single home dwellings, guided by British planning movements that favoured limited densification of urban areas. With the amalgamation of the city in 1929, new citywide zoning bylaws were being rolled out. Combined with new theories of constructing large-scale housing and space found in the federal government’s Post WW2 Housing efforts, Maclean Park offered a large canvas for renewal. The project’s housing design would also differ from social housing existing precedents like Little Mountain which were more modest, wood-frame walk-up apartments. Social studies began to be conducted recognizing how this would reconceptualize the idea of housing and how people interacted with built environments in the city. These studies were done by government agencies, principally the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) which must be considered when evaluating potential bias.

New city departments were established to coordinate the immense, precedent setting expropriation effort. The federal government invested millions as well into National Film Board of Canada films that supported the idea that urban brought urban vitality. Planning would go on throughout the 1950s, with projects breaking ground in the early 1960s. The Christ Church of China would find itself within Project 2, a renewal component involving the construction of maisonettes and apartment towers. When completed, it would provide over 300 units of public housing. Although the project only covered a small fraction of the total plan, its ethnic composition was nearly completely Chinese, presenting unique sociological factors for planners to consider. Social studies also revealed in early planning stages that residents were reluctant to change; A 1966 study by Donald Bethune of the University of British Columbia surveyed 103 males within the new housing project area, 27 of whom were Chinese and lived more communally. The research found that unmarried Chinese males were more reliant on community services and favoured

co-housing more than white unmarried men of the same age group. 19 of the 26 married Chinese men had wives back in China due to immigration policies, yet researchers
found they carried themselves with greater self-care than whites, and had better social connections (Bethune, 1966). These findings foreshadowed much of the conflict that grew rapidly in the proceeding years.

BEGINNING OF EXPROPRIATION NEGOTIATIONS:

On January 22 1963, Vancouver City Council considered a letter by Chinatown-based lawyer Mr. Harry Fan, representative for the CCOC. Dated October 30th, he claims grievances against the city on a promise made the year prior that all churches and schools would not be affected by the redevelopment in the East End, whereas the Project 2 planning documents indicated the Church along with other institutions would be demolished. Mr. Fan argued that the city had failed to provide consistent language, jeopardizing the church's future as clearance for Project 2 drew closer.

The Director of Planning furnished a response expressing "it is proposed to clear all buildings within the area 6 and to re-use the cleared land for residential use in accordance with a comprehensive design and for street widening. This proposal therefore includes the acquisition and clearance of the Christ Church of China property." The Director of Planning further noted on January 16th "...if the redevelopment project is approved in its present form the property would be acquired and cleared by the City and Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. The relocation of such structures and similar buildings which may be required to be cleared as part of the redevelopment program is under continuing study to ensure that arrangements as equitable as possible are devised." In response to Mr. Fan's specific grievance, this was filed "With regard to the receipt of advice by the pastor and chairman of the church that all churches and schools would not be affected by the redevelopment, I have no knowledge that any such categorical statement has ever been made either by the Board of Administration or the Director of Planning" (Office of The City Clerk, 1967).

There was also discontent amongst the church's congregation and their lawyer on how the church would be integrated into the redevelopment scheme. The City's program made no real provision for public consultation because through envisioned total renewal, justified by planners by the dilapidated nature of their community; no time could be squandered in combating renewal before it creeped into other districts. For the church, this reality was bleak. There were little means to prove their legitimacy within the city's approved policy framework for clearance. In the next few years, Project 1, just south of the church, would be completed with the next three hundred units of public housing being delivered later the decade in Project 2, which included the church. Project 2 included the church's property and formal expropriation negotiations began in 1966. This came three years after Maclean Park's first phase opened in 1963 just south of the church. The church's demands would now be tested (Vancouver Real Estate Services).

1966-1970: ESCALATION IN GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION

In September of 1966, city negotiations indicated the CCOC wanted a "straight swap" of their existing property for a site already earmarked the City's plan for religious use. In his notes, the city negotiator deemed this "impossible", recognizing the $25,000 difference in assessed value between the church's current and desired site. The church's existing parcel was 3,000 square feet, while the lot at Parcel "A" was 33,000 sq ft in size. In November, the city offered Mr. Harry Fan the Catholic Church building at Princess and Pender, which he declined in March of 1967, reiterating the church's intent to build a new church of its own. During this time, the Church held services on the main floor at 340 Keefer, housing congregation members on the second floor. These members were often newcomers given the lifting of restrictions in 1947; hence the church was invaluable interim housing for Chinese immigrants.

At a time when the Federal government was reluctant to house immigrants given existing tension between the Crown and Chinese people, spaces like the church constructed a needed social feeling of ownership only blocks away from the Immigration Building, where Chinese immigrants were processed when arriving on Canadian soil. An ancillary 1903 dwelling was found at the Church's rear, having no basement and being thinner in form. Mr. Philip Wong, a church official, informed city appraisers in February of 1967 that 2 rooms were rented for $25.00 a month, 4 for $20.00, and 1 for $15.00. There was a total of seven sleeping rooms. This mixed building use was characteristic of how the community adapted with increased emigration from China coupled with a growingly more progressive Canadian society (Vancouver Real Estate Services).

The city phoned Mr. Fan's office on April 6th, when they were informed that the church was opposed to losing their existing site. The city now considered immediate expropriation. By the 17th, Harry Fan declared negotiations to be "fruitless", declining a city-appointed arbitrator. The City's final offer to the Church was confirmed to be $20,000 in August, as the city deemed its "rooming house" use detrimental to its value. Potential private housing developers of the site at Parcel "A" gave notice to the city that subdividing Parcel "A" at Pender and Gore would be needed and subdividing it for the church would be "undesirable" owing to the developers being handed a disadvantage (Office of The City Clerk, 1967).

The city forcibly expropriated the church's lot on November 14th, 1967. At this time, media attention mounted. Mr. Fan spoke to the Vancouver province on November 16th, stating "this isn't like a business, you don't buy it out and it moves somewhere else… these are elderly people. There is sentimental value in the church. If it is taken away the Church will disband" (The Province, 1967). In December, Mr. Fan swore an affidavit that the Church's offer stood to acquire Parcel "A' at $44,500 and to sell the Church property at $22,000. At a presentation to Council that month, the Church stated they were the only church on record offering to buy the lot and would build the new church designed to the city's approval. According to the Church, only one offer had been made by a Vancouver solicitor, representing another private interest, in August of 1967, expressing intent for a community centre development on Parcel "A". No plan had been received by the city and no financial arrangements were made.

The Church asked that the proposal be "not taken seriously" and further that a community centre would not conform to the city's designation of the parcel for religious use. A further demand was, as a displaced property owner, for the city to extend "indulgence" and entertain the proposition for their acquisition of the corner lot (Office of The City Clerk, 1967). City officials met with the C.M.H.C on January 10th, 1968, and discussed disposal of Parcel "A'; seven months had elapsed since city advertising began for potential developers. As a privately sponsored community centre could not "realistically" be achieved in Parcel "A', it was decided that it be offered to the Christ Church of China at a price of $44,500. The recommendation was endorsed by the Urban Renewal Co-ordinating Committee on January 24th.

In a letter to the Law Department a week later, Mr. Fan gave authority for the city to take possession of the church at their convenience, and in turn, provide the Church with the Yugoslav Society Hall for rental during construction of the new church. He also reiterated the Church's firmness in getting $22,000.00 for the original property. In April of 1968, the property was vacant and prepared for demolition. Johnson and McKinnon Demolition was the successful lowest bidder to raze the lot for $790.00, and demolition was approved by Council on July 13th, 1968. The turning of the sod for the new church happened in May of 1970 and it opened around 1974 (Vancouver Sun,1970).

ANALYSIS OF GOVERNMENT ACTIONS THROUGH A SOCIAL HISTORY LENS:

The CCOC affair indicates the absence of varied consultation tools that the city had at their disposal. As viewed in negotiations, there was no clarity regarding the future development of Parcel A; but the church eventually secured it after media exposure and legal support. The bureaucratic chain of command established through CMHC funding bound the city to secure their approval on acquisitions, which ultimately slowed down the CCOC process. This can be pinned on one measure, expropriation. In city correspondence, evaluations were made based on building integrity; Section 193 B of the Vancouver Charter, underpinned such expropriation measures. It outlined: The city may acquire real property for the purpose of furthering any plan for the improvement or rehabilitation of areas which in the opinion of the Council have become or are tending to become blighted or substandard areas (Vancouver Charter) .

What this section of the Charter amounted to was expropriation law, at a time before similar provincial policies had even been enacted (Chow, 74). This is the only legal mechanism recurringly mentioned throughout the city's internal files on the Christ Church of China (Office of The City Clerk, 1967). This policy restricted and worsened negotiations between the city and Church in the coming years. It also came to embody exclusionary zoning that separated Chinese Canadians in the area from their history in a precedent setting act of state intervention.

City negotiation notes provide clarity on how officials attempted to work within 193 B's parameters. The shortcomings of planning are best viewed through the negotiation correspondence, which shows that expropriation was a mere procedural step in broader renewal, and that the methods to secure expropriation should not be questioned. It is clear through the city's notes that securing expropriation at the lowest cost to the city was the principal objective of the initial clearance process. An unamed city official was assigned to negotiate with the church and report their opinions back to the Urban Renewal Committee and federal officials. Someone who the negotiator consulted was Rhodes Elliott of the Engineering Department, who maintained that the property evaluation should be kept at 21,000 as the church had doubled as a rooming house. His counsel guided the negotiator in expressing the City's demands (Office of the City Clerk). This strict approach impaired the city from raising larger concerns on whether greater immigration social services should be provided or whether Maclean Park would have benefited from an increased allotment of cultural/community uses. Limiting assessment of the area to physical building conditions overlooked larger consequences of dismissing the possible social impact of the project, especially considering that this was a marginalized group who had only gained the right to vote in 1947 and held public office for the first time in 1952 (Vancouver Real Estate Services).

In 1967, the city approached lawyer representative Mr. Fan offering the Ukrainian Church as it would be vacated for renewal, However Mr. Fan insisted that they relocate to the more convenient site at Parcel "A". Recognizing the 193B restrictions, the city negotiator had begun offering ad-hoc sites to try and appease the church, a breakdown of the city's intimidatory stance and evidence of poor response. An absence of measures that supported relocation was being more clear and evidences the city's firm unwillingness to consider a dedicated new site for the church (Office of The City Clerk, 1967).

THE CHURCH'S PLACE WITHIN WIDER FEDERAL CLEARANCE PROGRAMS:

The city did attempt to compromise what they could, raising the purchasing offer from 18,000 to 21,000 by the end of negotiations Still, the city's inability to re-work planning policies for the area beyond the CCOC placed them in a defensive position that brought increasing public scrutiny. Although behind closed doors, the city attempted to use legal leverage to expropriate the church, some council members were far more bombastic in belittling the church in public. Councillor Harry Rankin remarked in November of 1967: " It has no architectural value, it is holding up 300 units of public housing." This sardonic display also aligned with a more sinister undertone to renewal; if the neighborhood was erased, there would be no community character or physical presence to preserve. Portraying the church as an obstinate holdout instead of a

community institution destabilized by the neighbourhood's erasure proved an intimidating way to force compliance. Evading expropriation was the only means the church had at their disposal given the complete initial rejection for planning the project alongside government agencies that instigated their fight.

There were also underlying motivations that trickled down to the church with the expansion of the freeway and a planned 45 million waterfront expressway that would run on the north side of Strathcona. Other freeways would cut directly through the neighbourhood as part of a larger freeway project designed to run through the city's core. Regardless of the city's intent, the removal of commercial and mix-used buildings through the Maclean Park project helped the development of freeways and pushed Chinese economic activity west of Gore. For example, the Hip Sang Co, discussed earlier as an anchor enterprise in the area, moved to 227 Keefer after their original property was razed, an indication of the burden that Chinese businesses took on when they both resided and had commercial enterprises in the area (Vancouver Planning Department, 1966). Ominously described as a casualty of urban renewal in local papers: "Soon, they will move toward 340 Keefer, chewing apart the Hip Sang vegetable company building, empty now except for cabbage crates, and the eight drab houses at the end of the block, also empty" ; the company was forced to relocate after it was razed (The Province, 1967).

The Hip Sang produce company represents the reality of those who, not only had to residentially relocate, but commercially relocate to areas where joint residential and commercial use were not permitted. If the freeway had run through Chinatown, the Hip Sang produce company would not only have had to relocate once, but would have been displaced again from 227 Keefer after already witnessing their previous community's erasure through the city's psychologically damaging tactics. Although two separate projects, the freeway project amplified the negative effects of the adjacent Maclean Park renewal scheme.

ANDRAS'S POLICY REVERSAL:

The city's approach demonstrated that the rationale of physical decay and poor zoning use in renewal planning had been used to justify expropriation to an extent where it suppressed the cultural and social value of Chinese organizations, as well as dehumanizing its residents on an individual level. The community had faced decades of repression, enduring the Chinese Exclusion Act, head taxes, inability to vote, and workplace discrimination, only to have the city introduce renewal plans that would displace and, in certain cases, upend their lives. When the Minister of Housing Paul Hellyer, and subsequently minister Robert Andras visited Strathcona in 1969, they were struck at the lack of social study on the impact of renewal. Andras toured the Raymur Place project east of Mclean Park Housing, questioning whether the projects were " creating the kind of total environment conducive to social and psychological development of urban residents and increasing economic viability of urban areas" (The Sun, 1971).

Andras's previous position as minister of Indian Affairs had given him exposure to another marginalized group in Canadian society, and the ramifications of discriminatory state policies. His aide, Dan Coates, expressed that his role in the department of Indian affairs was causal to him being more open to the Strathcona Property Owners and Tenants Association, better known as S.P.O.T.A and Chinese residents' views on displacement and urban renewal. After his visit, Andras formally severed federal renewal funds, choosing instead to pursue a program of rehabilitation in Strathcona, investing 2.5 million in roadwork and utilities that had been neglected during the renewal process. Grants were also provided to homeowners to fix-up their properties, implementing a preservation-based approach (Strathcona Property and Tenant Owners Association).

This only reinforces the backwardness in how the CMHC, and particularly the city, acted. What Andras resolved in 1971, that federal intervention was not justified, had been the central point in expropriating the CCOC. In less than two years, the CMHC and city went from actively intimidating the church to incentivizing the preservation of the neighbourhood. Now homeowners were being encouraged to restore their houses, not forcibly displaced; The CCOC was a microcosm of the broader community's struggle: their expendability in experimental planning policies.

KEY TAKEAWAYS:

The church operating on the corner of Gore and Pender today is in no way testament of the city's goodwill in compromising, but rather speaks to the tenacity of the Chinese community, in particular their lawyer Harry Fan who kept the community's social fabric intact. The city has never apologized to the CCOC for the distress inflicted upon the community and their inability to preserve the economically established Chinese district and redress historical wrongs. The Christ Church of China's struggle can be categorized within two categories of the City of Vancouver's official 2018 apology to the Chinese population. One, that: "City bylaws restricted where Chinese people could own and run businesses" and two, that: "The elected officials of the City of Vancouver used their role as leaders to sow the seeds of intolerance that emboldened individuals and groups to act upon anti- Asian discrimination" (City of Vancouver, 2018).

"City bylaws restricted where Chinese people could own and run businesses." This is evidenced by the forcible expropriation efforts and inaccessibility of legal aid to many residents in the area. Coupled with the novel use of expropriation statutes, the project was experimental and used the full weight of both existing and new departments to initially, in the 1940s, zone the areas as industrial, which was followed by federal intervention in throughout the 1960s. Through these processes of zoning and subsequent expropriation, the City of Vancouver and Federal Government displaced Chinese residents and restricted opportunities for Chinese residents to own and operate businesses in the Strathcona area as they had done since the late 19th century.

"The elected officials of the City of Vancouver used their role as leaders to sow the seeds of intolerance that emboldened individuals and groups to act upon anti- Asian discrimination." The City of Vancouver used federal involvement and funding to pursue what ultimately became a failed project, one which the city failed to admit even after the federal government implemented a moratorium of new renewal projects in 1969 (The Sun, 1971). The city's own records demonstrate the potential that projects had to displace residents with unprecedented levels of clearance; a potential that only grew with minimal cultural and community social services provided within redeveloped areas. A strong support to this theory is the fact that there has never been any legal challenge to the city or federal government actions in court, an indicator on how the Project has gone undocumented in being a product in the post-war national urban planning renewal program. In her thesis on renewal in Strathcona, Catherine Chow writes on the findings of academic Joanne Lee:

"In research interviews with Strathcona residents, professor Joanne Lee found that they were not advised of their right to protest the acquisition or to appeal for additional compensation. Her interview subjects explained that residents were told that they had no right and many accepted letters from City Hall as a death sentence, without appeal or recourse. Lee found that residents did not have the willingness to challenge government officials for fear of being labeled as "trouble makers", nor did they have the financial resources to do so, as there are no "known or reported legal cases." (Chow, 67). The city not only restricted where Chinese residents could live; disproportionately targeting them compared to other social groups in the city, but also used legal mechanisms to stifle opposition. Maclean Park remains the largest single site social housing project built in Vancouver's history and impacted existing racialized

communities drastically more than comparable Skeena Terrace and Little Mountain projects which were constructed on less developed land.

To close, irreconcilable harm was inflicted by the clearing and systematic erasure of the Chinese commercial district through the MacLean Park Housing project: the starkest manifestation of these policies being that Gore is now recognized as the Chinese Commercial district boundary, symbolic of how the city used land use policy to restrict economic opportunity and diminish the worth of Chinese social practices. The various levels of government involved failed to recognize the area as an intact social space for Chinese residents, far more than a sheer statistical concentration of people. City Charter Section 193B's use had wide ranging implications, serving as the main legal measure to advance renewal phases. Maclean Park represents a standalone example of federal intervention in Vancouver, a project which never reached full completion due to intense opposition from community organization which eventually compelled federal ministers, most notably Minister Robert Andras. Further, it increasingly became evident through the research progress that the city's general intent belied personal ambition of the planners involved.

Given that the freeways were never fully completed, the area is viewed as a grassroots movement success for S.P.O.T.A. and other organizations in the area. Maclean Park has come to exist as an isolated project, once envisaged within a sprawling scheme that now stands alone. The primary importance emerging from my research is that Maclean Park must not be separated from its history as a product of the City of Vancouver's and Federal Government actions which were a clear continuation of state sponsored ethnic discrimination that trickled down from federal immigration measures from the late 19th century through to after the Second World War. The actions which the City took in the 1940s in zoning the area to industrial use established precedent for increased state actions which catalyzed federally sponsored renewal in the 1960s (Office of The City Clerk, 1967). As noted earlier, the city's actions were irreversible; rezonings of this scale permanently alter how people interact with the space and social identities that can be fostered within in them; Maclean Park had a complex, culturally rich, Chinese community that struggled against state discrimination and managed to prosper in the face of it. Any dysfunctionality that then city used to justify their clearance efforts was a result of the City depreciating the value of the land and its occupants through zoning policies that displaced and dehumanized Chinese people.

Maclean Park demonstrates the ills of Mid-Century federal and renewal efforts that, when analyzed impartially against the City's historic treatment of Chinese Canadians and planning policy at the time, emerge as showing an experimental and discriminatory effort which amounted to blatant cultural erasure through codified planning laws. The is indisputably an extension of broader renewal efforts which have been decried with the progression of new planning movements evolving from increased national immigration since the 1970s and our city's increased recognition of historical injustice committed against Chinese Canadians.

The Christ Church of China stands today as a memorial for the Chinese social space and identity that was lost and the labourers who formed the backbone of the industrial district for decades since the City's establishment in fighting against state-sponsored suppression of their culture, forced separation from their families, and inability to access equal housing opportunities compared to white settler Canadians. The use of Section 193B and aggressive clearance measures only reaffirmed Chinese Canadians inability to access overall equal opportunity. Maclean Park Project 2 is a dark moment of state sponsored discrimination across all three levels of government that was implemented against Chinese Canadians, and this injustice still burns while it is not remembered in our society today.

Works Cited

Bethune, Blaine Donald. “Social Patterns of Older Men : A Study of the Social Activity Patterns and Needs of the
Unattached Aged Male in the Strathcona Area of Vancouver 1965-1966.” Open Collections, University of British Columbia, 12 May 1966, open.library.ubc.ca/soa/cIRcle/collections/ubctheses/831/items/1.0104749?o=1.

Chow, Catherine W. “Chinatown Geographies and the Politics of Race, Space and the Law.” University of British Columbia, 2007, <https://open.library.ubc.ca/collections/ubctheses/831/items/1.0077725>.

City Of Vancouver. “City of Vancouver’s Official Apology to the Chinese Canadian Community.” 22 April, 2018, https://vancouver.ca/files/cov/18-112-06%20chinese-apology-media-english.pdf.

Office of The City Clerk. “ Christ Church of China Property.” City of Vancouver Archives, 1967, searcharchives.vancouver.ca/christ-church-of-china-property.

Strathcona Property and Tenant Owners Association. “Dan Coates, ex-asst to Robert Andras 1968-1974 [interview].” City of Vancouver Archives, https://searcharchives.vancouver.ca/dan-coates-ex-asst-to-robert-andras-1968-1973-interview.

The Province, 16 Nov, 1967, pp. 2. ProQuest, https://www.proquest.com/historical-newspapers/november-16-1967-page-2-50/docview/2379787954/se-2.

The Sun, 25 March, 1971, pp. 47. ProQuest, https://www.proquest.com/historical-newspapers/march-25-1971-page-47-76/docview/2241094473/se-2.

Vancouver Board of Police Commissioners. “Chinese lotteries.” City of Vancouver Archives, 1932, https://searcharchives.vancouver.ca/chinese-lotteries.

“Vancouver Charter, SBC 1953, c 55.”, Can LII, https://www.canlii.org/en/bc/laws/stat/sbc-1953-c 55/latest/sbc-1953-c-55.html.

Vancouver Planning Department. “227 Keefer-Hip Sang Co.” City of Vancouver Archives, 1966, https://searcharchives.vancouver.ca/227-keefer-street-hip-sang-co.

Vancouver Real Estate Services. “340 Keefer Street.” City of Vancouver Archives, searcharchives.vancouver.ca/340-keefer-street.

The Vancouver Sun, 18 Nov, 1941, pp. 11. *ProQuest*, https://www.proquest.com/newspapers/august-18 1941-page-11-22/docview/2240122891/se-2.
