

February 23rd 1905.

Messrs Macpherson & Wilkinson,

Vancouver, B.C.

Gentlemen;-

Confirming our conversation of yesterday I would say that as regards your having signed the option for sale of the Dinsmore Island cannery, with the clause in relation to not engaging in the business for 10 ten years embodied therein, I distinctly remember your objections to that particular clause. I also remember my answer which was to the effect that the wording of that portion of the option was of my own choosing, that I did not consider it was an important enough point for you to quibble over, and that such an obligation I looked upon as being purely an honorary one, and one which could not be enforced in a court of law. In the case of those canneries controlled by Mr C.I. Wilson this clause, after considerable discussion over it between Mr Jarvis and myself, was eliminated, and I can assure you this would not have been agreed to by me had I any belief in the obligation being at best more than of an honorary nature.

In exchange for your giving an honorary undertaking to refrain from engaging in the business as a competitor, there was an implied undertaking on the part of the association to give their shareholders the preference over outsiders in the allotment of the positions which were at their disposal. In consideration of the manner in which the Association has violated this honorary obligation on their part, I consider their present opposition to your plans comes with very bad grace. Those who lack good faith in their dealings with others should not expect better treatment in return, and I am sorry to have to admit that to me the Association's hands appear anything but clean in this respect.

I may further state that personally I think the Association have compromised any case they might have against you by their failure to prosecute Mr Macpherson for having, in 1903, accepted the management of the Canadian Canning Co's plants. His action in that case was as flagrant a violation of the clause in question as your present proposed undertaking, and yet no notice of it was taken by them.

From the standpoint of a large shareholder in the B.C. Packers Association I would much prefer seeing this property you contemplate buying in the hands of someone like yourselves, who are also interested in that company. And while I would consider it both inadvisable and unfair to the B.C. Packers if you were to build a new cannery for the purpose of competing with them, I do not look upon the purchase of an old plant - which they were not themselves prepared to buy - in the same light. In the former case you would be using the money they gave you for the purpose of injuring their business; and this I cannot consider either honest nor fair. In the latter case however, you are buying something which already exists as a competitor to them, and since they could not acquire it themselves, it is better for them that it should be held by some one, whose holdings of their stock would make it an object for him to work his new acquisition in harmony with his other interests.

Yours truly

Henry Doyle

H.D.