391

21st April 1910.

Mr. Bowser, Esq.,
Victoria, B.C.

Dear Bowser; I am just in receipt of your letter of the 13th inst., and am sorry you are not willing to rectify the glaring injustices existing in the boat rating your department compiled. I am also in receipt of a letter from Babcock stating the rating must stand for this year, but implying there was a chance for revision in another season.

Personally I am satisfied you have not been directly responsible for the ratings made but have accepted the details worked out by others. But these others are either woefully ignorant of the subject they have passed judgement on, or have deliberately misled you. I am somewhat inclined to give them the benefit of the doubt and say their recommendations are due to ignorance, for Mr Babcock I hold primarily responsible and his knowledge of the situation is practically nil for he has not been in northern B.C. waters since 1902 or so and therefore can know nothing about fishing and canning conditions existing at the present time. Your natural reply to this would be

that the Department have their officials on the ground and that information is obtainable from them, but if this is so then Mr Babcock has gone directly opposite to their reports, as your officers, without exception, agree that in the instances recited in my former letter the rating is most manifestedly unjust and inexcusable. You will not find a single disinterested individual that will not, in these cases, condemn your decision as strongly as I do, and this being so it is futile to claim the rating as "eminently fair."

It will be an added injustice to favour some as you have done, for this season, and work a hardship on others, and then next year rearrange the boat rating taking 1910 operations into consideration in so doing. By so doing you will be giving the former a distinct and unwarranted advantage. To take an example in which I am personally not interested let us instance Clapton and the Oceanic. The former have every year put up twice the pack of the latter, and formerly with very no recognition in a larger boat rating. Without any possible reasonable excuse you this year put Clapton on a par with Oceanic so that next year if the rating is revised Clapton's position must suffer owing to the unfair advantage you gave Oceanic in 1910.

Yours sincerely

Henry Doyle