88

16th March 1911.

Hon. Minister of Marine & Fisheries,

Ottawa.

Dear Sir;-

I have to acknowledge receipt of your favour of the 9th inst., re granting of gill net licenses to Mr Desbrisay in connection with the Wales Island cannery.

As stated in my former letter I by no means oppose Mr Desbrisay's application for a cannery license but I am opposed to his being permitted the use of gill nets for the following reasons;-

1st. He can only use them to intercept Naas river fish, and doing so would nullify the object of your present boat rating.

2nd. He and his associates had previously agreed that if they were granted a cannery license they would undertake not to fish in the area influenced by the Naas river waters and by permitting the use of gill nets you will be giving more than they had already agreed to be contented with.

3rd. Issuing them 25 licenses has absolutely no other meaning or effect than to raise your own Boat Rating Commission's allotment of boats for the Naas river district from 240 to 265. As under the rating established my own cannery has been unjustly deprived of 15% of the number of boats formerly used I most decidedly object to any new comer being favoured until I at least have restored to me the number of boats which were wrongfully taken from me.

There are two points brought out in your letter on which you are evidently misinformed. The first is that "the Inspector of Fisheries for the district very strongly recommended that he should be given twenty-five gill net licenses to fish in Portland Inlet."

L. P. B. #2.

There is certainly some mistake about this for we know positively that the Inspector was the most strenuous opponent to the granting of licenses of any kind to Mr Desbrisay's company. We have his own admission as one reason for this that "he was on record with your department as recommending they be denied a canning license and he would not stultify himself by condemning his own recommendation in subsequently advocating that a license should be granted."

Again you say "every possible precaution was taken to guard the operations of the Naas River canners as no fishing by him will be allowed in Observatory Inlet or the Naas River." If you will look at the map a glance will show you that Portland Inlet is as much a continuation of the Naas river as the St Lawrence from Quebec to Anticisti Island is a continuation of the upper St Lawrence. Fully one third of the fish taken by Naas river canners are caught in Portland Inlet from the southern end of Wales Island to the entrance of Nasoga Gulf, and it is certainly no protective "precaution" for us to let him fish in our very waters.

I might mention that in this case at least the Hon. Mr Bowser has evidently taken the trouble of investigating matters more thoroughly than he did in the question of gasoline boats. I have been informed by one of Mr Desbrisay's associates that Hon. Mr Bowser has refused them a cannery license for Wales Island cannery on the ground that their operations would interfere with the Naas river fishing. I think in this he has gone further than he should as a matter of fairness to Mr Desbrisay but it is certainly less of an injustice to deny him it altogether than to limit the Naas canneries as you have done and by the issuance of gill net licenses to a new

L. P. B. #3.

comer, create fresh competition for them at their own expense.

Yours truly.

Henry Dyer

H. D.