Port Essington, B.C. Aug. 25th/02

Messrs. The B.C. Packers Assn.
Vancouver.

Gentlemen,-

I had an interview this morning with Mr Robert Cunningham concerning the property conveyed to us as part of the cannery purchase. I regret to have to report, that in my opinion Messrs. Cunningham & Son are not dealing with the Association in a just manner, as regards conveying to us property essential to the operation of plant of even the present size of the cannery.

In giving us an option to purchase, the option distinctly reads that Messrs. Cunningham & Son are to convey "all the lands, tenements, hereditaments, etc," held by them in connection with their cannery business, and "used in the operation of the cannery or canneries situated on said premises."

At the time option was given, a plan was also submitted which

purported to be a correct description of the land used in connection with the cannery. On examining into the question, I find that this plan does not include all the land used in connection. the Indian and Japanese houses, the Charcoal house and other buildings, absolutely necessary to the operation of a cannery, being on land retained by Messrs Cunningham and Son. Furthermore there is absolutely no room on the property that has been conveyed, for the erection of all of these out buildings. I pointed out to Mr Cunningham the unfairness of the transaction; that he had submitted a plan that was not a correct description of the land used by the cannery, and requested him to include sufficient extra to supply our requirements, I suggested he deed us a small plot on the down river side of the cannery proper, or if he desired to retain that for private use, that he give us an equivalent area in some other equally convenient location. This he declined to do,

Recommendations,

In view of the fact that what property Messrs. Cunningham & Son. have conveyed, is entirely inadequate for the erection of a cannery of the size we intend for the Skeena river, I reccommend that the new plant be erected on the site of the present Balmoral cannery, we have 160 acres in this purchase, and from my examination of the property it is well, and as regards ice, is better adapted for the plant than is Port Essington. From the standpoint of a merchandising business, it is also to our advantage to erect the plant where we can operate a store, and from Mr Lord's report of the store business done by the British America Cannery, the profits to be made would reduce the cost of the pack by a very handsome amount.

Mr Cunningham offered to purchase from us the site of the cannery he has conveyed to us, but I cannot reccommend the acceptance of his proposition. In the first place owing to the owners means that the property, which is valuable as

a cannery site, cannot be used by anyone else to erect a competitive plant on, and in the second place we can retain the ownership and still make the investment very remunerative by tearing down the cannery and other old shacks at present located on it, and leasing for short terms, say ten years, small parcels of the property with provisos in the leases that same shall be cancelled if used or sublet for any fishing enterprises. I also think some returns can be had in the shape of wharfage by putting the present wharf to general business usuage.

In view of the fact that the shacks used by the Indians were absolutely necessary to the cannery this season, and as such would have had to be used by Messrs. Cunningham & Son had the cannery remained their property, I cannot recommend payment of the rental asked for their use by Mr Cunningham, the question of payment of which it was agreed was to be left until after my visit was made.

Yours truly.

Henry Doyle

Letter re Cunningham

H. D.