5

27th December 1910.

Hon. The Minister of Marine & Fisheries,

Ottawa.

Dear Sir;-

Your favour of the 9th inst., was duly received but I have delayed replying until I was in possession of statistics necessary to prove my contentions.

In the fourth paragraph of your letter you state that on referring to the measurements taken by the Commissioners you find they disprove my statement that the floor space of the Mill Bay cannery is more than twice as large as any other two Naas canneries combined. They give you 23,808 square feet as covering my floor space, whereas as a matter of fact it is 24,000 square feet in the canning plant proper and 8200 square feet in auxilary buildings which both Messrs Babcock and Williams admitted at the time of their visit should be included in the general total as being part and parcel of the floor space utilized in our operations. Thus our actual floor space is 32,200 square feet, (instead of 23,808 as they report) and this area is more than twice that of any two of our competitors combined, as is our claim. The proper area is set forth in detail in our letter of 15th June to Messrs Williams and Babcock, (which letter they agreed to submit to you with their report) and it can be substantiated by the independent measurements taken by the board of fire insurance underwriters and shown on the maps in their possession. I think the deliberate misrepresentation of this floor space question is sufficient proof of my charge of the unfair actions of Mr Williams, and fully warrants

L. P. B. #2.

my statement that fair treatment and justice is not to be expected from him.

Again in giving you the average annual pack, as per the returns mentioned in your letter, the Commissioners have misstated the case, and I feel that in this instance also the result was intended to work out to our disadvantage. You give the average annual pack of Mill Bay for a period of five years as 11,220 cases against 11,826 for Arrandale, and 12,033 for Port Nelson. Against this we beg to submit that the following table will give a more correct return;-

	Mill Bay	Port Nelson	Arrandale	Naas Harbour
1905	12,677	9,647	10,201	--
1906	7,466	9,248	9,261	6,558
1907	--	10,327	11,237	10,268
1908	17,400	15,915	15,214	--
1909	15,100	14,829	13,217	--
	52,643	60,166	59,131	16,826
Average 5 years		12,033	11,826	
" 4 "	13,160			
" 2 "				8,413

It would not be fair to divide our pack by five when the plant was only operated in four of the seasons mentioned, nor would it be right to include any year previous to 1905 in the reckoning. Prior to that year the Mill Bay and Naas Harbour canneries (owned by the same company) had the river all to themselves, and made no effort to fish energetically. In 1905 both Port Nelson and Arrandale were built, and since then the total pack of salmon on Naas river has nearly trebled, showing the effect competition had on fishing

L. P. B. #3.

operations. I therefore contend that it is only from the time competition commenced (that is from the year of origin of Port Nelson and Arrandale) that an average of packs can be justly compared, and that by doing so it will be seen our average is the highest for the river and exceeds the figures submitted by the Rating Commissioners by nearly 2,000 cases.

As to your remark that Mill Bay like the others is only a 1 line cannery, we will admit this is true. The Carlisle cannery on Skeena river is also but a 1 line plant as is likewise the Alexandra, but to the former the Commissioners alloted 70 boats while the latter received only 31. Our capital investment in our " 1 line plant " far exceeds that of any of our competitors, as the Carlisle exceeds the Alexandra, and we therefore contend that the question of 1 line or 2 line is irrelevant to the subject of boat rating. The Commissioners recognized this in the cases of the Carlisle and Alexandra canneries, as well as others on the Skeena, and also on Rivers Inlet, and we reiterate that to adopt one principle for those sections and a diametrically opposite one in my case is a deliberate and most unjust discrimination which cannot be excused, nor can it be explained on any ground that will reflect credit on those responsible for it.

I think the above fully answers that portion of your letter which criticizes my general statements and I feel confident that an impartial investigation on your part will alter your opinion as to unfairness having been shown the Mill Bay cannery. It would also demonstrate that the Commissioners did accept "particular conditions as a criterion" for the other sections, but reversed their own opinions in dealing with the Naas.

L. P. B. #4.

As to the last portion of your letter in relation to Mr Williams personally, and as Inspector, I note you most emphatically state that no charges of the character to which I referred have ever reached your Department. As to this I must of course accept your statement but in self justification must say that Mr Cunningham himself was my authority that such statements had been made to the Department and he informed me one of the objects of his visit here was to investigate them. In furtherance of his mission he asked me if I personally had knowledge of any such irregularities on the part of Mr Williams as had been complained of. As to any evidence or any charge having been submitted Mr Cunningham while his investigation was in progress that gentleman can inform you better than I could. I may say however that I was informed by others of what they had told Mr Cunningham on the subject, and the charges made were certainly very serious reflections on Mr Williams honesty.

As to my own experience, as I told Mr Cunningham, personally I know nothing concerning the specific charges made. You say however "this Department is not prepared to retain in its service Fishery Officers who have been guilty of betraying the trust reposed in them" and in this connection I think my foregoing statements prove a betrayal of trust as concerns Mr Williams' acts as a Boat Rating Commissioner. If you investigate that question, and find my contentions correct, it may lead you to look into other matters as well and enable you to determine the truth or falseness of the charges made concerning the gentleman under discussion.

Yours truly

Henry Doyle

H. D.