

13043 Ventura Blvd.,
North Hollywood, Cal.
24th March 1951.

Mr. W. M. Read, Director,
University of Washington Press,
111 Thompson Hall,
Seattle 5, Wash.

Dear Mr. Read:-

I duly received your letter of the 28th ulto., and the result it announced came as no surprise as the length of time which had elapsed since I previously heard from you was an indication of what your Publications Council had decided upon.

In Walter P. Chrysler's "Life of an American Workman" he cited his employer telling him that when he received letters that made him mad he set them aside for three or four days until he had calmed down. I followed this practice on receiving your announcement and for good measure waited a fortnight longer during which time I examined my manuscript and the marginal notations made by its critics. I trust this fact will be given consideration in reviewing this my reply.

I of course expected my story would require editing and was quite prepared to accept same. No one could object to 'develop' or 'salon' in an American publication though in an English edition he would probably find the words written 'develope' and 'saloon'. Neither could he object to 'Bering' in place of 'Behring' for the sea discovered by, and named for, Vitus Behring, the Danish navigator, since usage has made the corruption common. Spelling mistakes and grammatical errors should of course be corrected and even 'today' replace 'to-day' if that meets with greater acceptance.

To deal more specifically with the critics marginal comments I would touch on them in the order of their notation.

P. 6. This notation is for me to rewrite the first paragraph recounting the establishment of trading stations at points that intercepted the lanes of travel frequented by the native Indians in their tribal intercourse. My statement was made on the authority of the early traders whose journals establish such foundation to be as I have recorded and anyone familiar, as I am, with these early narrations can vouch for the correctness of my statement.

P. 11. Names of the men who first conceived the idea of canning Fraser river salmon? I have these names and am agreeable to their being given if thought necessary or advisable.

P.29. The query as to the present abundance of Sacramento river salmon as compared to the 1870s must have been made before the critic had read any further for it was answered fully later on and confirmed on the authority of the California Fish and Game Commission. It is not therefore an unsupported statement on my part.

P.94. The query is regarding the present day abundance of the fall run chinooks in the coastal areas of the Columbia river watershed. The facts, I contend, speak for themselves and I know of my own knowledge that in the first 30 years of the Columbia river fishery the lower river runs never attained the magnitude they enjoyed after the establishment of hatcheries on the Clackamas and neighboring Columbia river tributaries. 10-day almost the whole supply comes from this area.

P.98 and on. The critics seem also to have questioned my account of the first establishment of canneries in Alaska. I have documentary data covering my statements in this regard. As to the formation and early history of the Alaska Packers Association I was personally acquainted with many of the original shareholders of that company and my account of its formation and early accomplishments was largely based on what these shareholders told me personally and was confirmed by the general unanimity of their confidences to me.

P.310. The query was how did large early runs arrive at Upper Fraser spawning beds in 1949 when fishing was not permitted until 28th July that year? The answer is they travelled up during the closed period previous to 28th July, as was the recognized habit of all the Upper Fraser sockeye salmon runs.

In your first letter to me, before you ever saw my manuscript, you very frankly said if my work was too propagandistic your University Press would not care to publish it. I replied it unquestionably would be thought propaganda for my viewpoint just as the arguments of advocates of the prevailing theories would be regarded by me as propaganda for the ideas they expressed. I contended it is the duty of a university controlled press to exhibit both the pro and con sides of every educational subject they profess to teach and that it certainly is not their duty to fill student minds with only one side of any given controversy.

Your Publications Council in objecting "to that part of the manuscript which deals with the biology of the salmon and with conservation" is in effect denying the right of myself - or any other exponent of a fresh viewpoint - the right to be heard before the court of public opinion. It is equivalent to trying a case before a judge who gives full latitude to the prosecution or defense, as

the case may be, while preventing the opposing side presenting its evidence or to argue its case. Since the days of Galileo this has been the attitude of all "standpatters" and I am sorry to see some of our educators still belong to that outmoded school.

To my mind to revise my history of the industry in the manner your Publications Council suggests, leaving out all the moral the recital was intended to convey, would be like acting Hamlet with Hamlet deleted. I did not set out just to record "old wives' tales" but to point out the failure of the practices followed so long without effective results and to urge the study of other methods, especially those of trained biologists who refused to remain in the deeply rutted pathways of policies that have long "been whitened in the balance and found wanting."

To deal specifically with the two main points your Publications Council raised I will consider them in the order named.

1. That some of the very personal remarks concerning individuals may be libelous.

This I have every reason to believe is not at all likely. I had this feature constantly in mind when writing these memoirs and out of the wealth of information at my command chose only those that came under my personal observation, or, if otherwise, ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ such as I can support with substantiating evidence. I was quite prepared to have eliminated any story or portion of story that could not stand these tests.

2. That "your personal grudge against governmental officials should not be allowed to assume an important place in the story."

Even after more than a fortnight's calm meditation on this point I strongly feel this accusation is entirely untrue, uncalled for, and unworthy of your Publications Council.

In the first place I have not now, nor ever had, a personal grudge against any of the government officials. Every individual has a right to his personal opinions and while I differed from Mr. Babcock on many of the ideas he advocated, and, for almost 40 years argued them with him as strenuously as I knew how, we always were steadfast personal friends. When old age and illness forced his withdrawal from a lifetime of service I wrote him a letter deploring his retirement and in that letter stated that in my opinion he had accomplished more than any other individual connected with the industry had done, not only for our sockeye salmon fishery but the fisheries of America as a whole. In acknowledging my tribute Mr. Babcock

wrote he valued such praise from me above that of any other of his numerous correspondents. Both these letters are still extant. Do they indicate to your Publications Council I had "a personal grudge" against the man who for nearly four decades ruled like a czar the Fisheries Department of the Province of British Columbia. ?

Since the service was first started I have known every man who occupied office as the British Columbia representative of the Canadian Government's Department of Fisheries and was always on friendly cordial terms with them all. Indeed the two most outstanding, worthy and highest regarded to all these Inspectors, Col. F. H. Cunningham and Major J. A. Motherwell, who between them held the office for more than 40 years, were, and still are, amongst my closest personal friends, and both of them largely share my views as to the derelictions and shortcomings of the higher officials at Ottawa.

I have also known most of these higher Ottawa officials and while deploring their lack of initiative and timidity on making decisions or changes vital to the interests placed in their keeping I never questioned their personal integrity or bore "a personal grudge" against a single one of them. To ascribe such motive to me as the root of my opposition to the policies they have pursued shows your Publications Council has given no study to the accusations I made or to the foundation on which my assertions were based.

In the high heat of a dispute it often happens that when the exponent of one viewpoint is unable, or unwilling, to maintain his ground he quickly concludes his argument by calling his opponent a liar and thinks that bald and unsupported statement clinches and settles the matter. I am afraid your Publications Council in blithely, and without a word of substantiation, dismissed my argument as purely expressions of personal grudge, took a leaf from the liar-caller's book. I feel this was unfair to me and unworthy of those who profess to teach our student classes what of knowledge is truth and what is false.

Why is it that when responsible public officials make statements, even such as are sometimes known to be false, their opinions are respected and treated with at least lip service, and their motives left unquestioned, while if an individual says exactly the same things, and supports it with evidence, one immediately suspects personal prejudices or a hidden motive ? Mr Babcock's annual reports from 1902 on frequently emphasized that Ottawa was derelict in its guardianship duties respecting British Columbia's salmon fisheries. Although the costs were federal responsibilities - not provincial ones - he spent the Province's

money in removing dams, like that at Quesnel, building fishways, as that at Medziadin Falls, erecting a hatchery at Seaton Lake, and in hundreds of other ways performed other unfilled duties of the Dominion Department of Fisheries. Your Publications Council I am sure will not ascribe such activities on Mr. Babcock's part as evidence of a personal grudge against Ottawa officials, but when I repeat the things he said your Council curtly dismisses them as personal prejudices!!

Nothing could be stronger worded than the resolutions of the Fisheries Research Council of Canada and the International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission against the Canadian Government's Department of Fisheries permitting the diversion of water from the Upper Fraser river watershed, which resolutions the Department of Fisheries completely ignored. Yet when I cited these resolutions verbatim in my manuscript a "personal grudge" is given by your Publications Council as my sole motivation!!

At the Victoria hearing on the Aluminum Company's application the Dominion Department of Fisheries itself informed the public the diversion proposed would destroy 10% of the entire Skeena river sockeye run and would rob the Fraser of 55% of the total flow of river water passing Fort George. The Quesnel tributary also lies above that city and to-day a dam on the Quesnel has also been sanctioned by the Ottawa officials which will make a further great shrinkage in the waterflow at Fort George. The Department of Fisheries itself has published these derelictions in its maintenance and care of the great Fraser river sockeye fishery and why should your Publications Council regard such information when repeated by me to be expressions of a personal grudge and of so little value to the industry as to be unworthy of inclusion in my history of the Pacific salmon industry. ? Surely the public is entitled to know what is happening now.

Furthermore if any of your Publications Council has read Bruce Hutchison's very excellent book, THE FRASER, they will have noticed therein that the Province of British Columbia have under contemplation the erection of a series of dams that would impound the entire Fraser river flow almost to where the Thompson tributary joins it. The main dam would be over 700 feet high, a height that means absolute extermination of all the sockeye salmon runs to the entire upper Fraser and would render useless the vast expenditure of monies the International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission have expended on stream improvements all along the Fraser and its tributaries from Heli's Gate to the uppermost spawning areas of the great river.

The Province of British Columbia has no right or title in this fishery. Its destruction would mean the

loss of hundreds of millions of dollars annually to the Canadian and American peoples. Some one should let the public know what threatens so important a food supply. It is bad enough that official bodies should ignore the danger and I leave it to an individual to direct attention to the matter before it becomes an accomplished fact. But it passes my comprehension why a body such as your Publications Council should go out of its way to not only suppress the information but add insult to injury by ascribing my motives to an unworthy cause.

In all the instances I cited I do not think one can be found unattended by substantiative proof. If such can be shown I would willingly delete it. Every statement I made was based on data I personally possessed or can produce. Protests and resolutions of various official bodies I gave in full. I quoted from the briefs and letters of the Department of Fisheries their own admissions that what they acquiesced in and sanctioned was detrimental to the fishery they had sworn to foster and protect. What advance in knowledge or educational benefit can one expect your university to achieve when its Publications Council denies its student body the right and opportunity to consider all phases of the problem?

Dr. Johnson once remarked to his biographer, Boswell that "Human experience, which was constantly contradicting theory, was the great test of truth." What progress in ascertaining truth can your university achieve when its Publications Council only allow the students to learn a story documented on one side only and that suppresses all contradicting data on the pretext that however substantiated a case is offered against prevailing opinions it ipso facto must be regarded as expressions of a "personal grudge" when voiced by an individual?

Yours faithfully

ED/P.