

Launer, B. C.

21st March 1928.

Dear Chesterton:-

I saw Hungerford yesterday and he told me he had given Laing the papers I had sent him but had not discussed the matter. He was very friendly and said he would have a talk with Hogg when the latter returned and would do all he could to help me attain my object.

Afterwards I saw Holt of the Commerce. He said that to the best of his recollection my name had never been suggested for the position at any conference at which he had been present, and most certainly he had never objected to my appointment. He took the ground that the bank would not interfere in the selection of any company's staff personnel. This was something entirely up to the company to attend to. The bank of course would not make loans to a company who had for its manager someone whom they had reason to be suspicious of, but this was a different matter from dictating who should, or should not, run the company. As far as I was concerned he said the only thing they might have against me was that Winch's failure was attributed to his having been guided by my advice. I replied to this that Winch owned 70% of the share capital, anyone that knew him well knew he was self-willed and arbitrary, and that between his disposition and the voting control his shares gave him he alone dictated the company's policy. I had been opposed to the expansion that he took on, disapproved of the cannery sites selected, and had had no say in the expenditure incurred. I was a shareholder in the company and a director but my office was not even in their office; the management was entirely in Winch & Co's hands. I added that I did not want him to take my word for these statements but that Colthard was also a director and could confirm all that I had said.

After seeing Holt I again called on Hungerford and told him of my conversation with the former. He said he was sure Holt had given me the true version of the matter and he was equally confident Laing had taken a similar stand as the B. of M. also would not dictate as Jarvis had suggested both banks had done. Of Jarvis Hungerford did not seem to have a high opinion; thought he was slippery, and for reasons of his own was opposed to my appointment but wished to appear friendly and so put the onus on the banks.

The thought has occurred to me that if Jarvis is trying to double cross me in this matter whether it might not be well to send copies of my correspondence to each individual director in Eastern Canada. This of course would antagonize Jarvis but would let the others know what is transpiring. It would probably do no good as I think most of the other directors are fellow stockbrokers and very likely they are all working in together. On the other hand outside brokers are viciously attacking the company just now, the shareholders meeting comes on in a fortnight or so, and Jarvis might be sacrificed by his associates for the sake of harmony. I do not think however that this is at all likely. I would like to know what you would advise under the circumstances.

Yours sincerely