

Ladner, B. C.

7th March 1928.

AEmelius Jarvis, Esq.,

Hotel Vancouver, B.

Vancouver B. C.

Dear Jarvis:-

I enclose herewith copies and extracts of documents in my possession that have a bearing on my resignation in 1904. If these are not sufficient to impress upon you and the banks the injustice of the treatment meted out to me I have ample further evidence to back them up with.

My contention is that the changes and alterations made in plants were in accordance with the understanding on which the B.C.P.A. was formed and on which the underwriting syndicate were induced to make the investment. To substantiate this I enclose (Exhibit A) an extract from the statement I submitted to the underwriting syndicate, and (Exhibit B) Messrs Munn & Larsen's independent statement confirming my contention.

I also enclose copy of the report I submitted to the Directors in October 1902 covering my inspection trip of our northern plants. This shows the condition I found the plants in, my impression of their management, and an outline of what I considered should be done to take proper advantage of our opportunities and investments. This I have marked Exhibit C. I contend it does not show any evidence of extravagant ideas as to changes and improvements necessary.

Exhibit D. is a copy of the recommendations submitted Dec. 15th, 1902 by the Executive Board as to proposed expenditure for 1903. It will be noted that not only were all three members of the Executive responsible for this recommendation, (although later on it was all charged to me), but that the estimated costs were compiled by the District Managers, all old experienced cannerymen who had erected their own former plants and had a knowledge of building costs and plant installations. It is also to be remembered that it was these same men who supervised all the changes, engaged the labour, requisitioned all the materials purchased, and were primarily responsible for such increased costs as were incurred. But it did not suit the Head Office conspirators to charge these managers with the over expenditure. It was I they were after, and sole responsibility was ascribed to me.

As evidence of how the accounts were manipulated to put blame on me and to cover up operating losses by ascribing depreciation and repair and renewal costs to Capital expenditure I enclose, (Exhibit E.) extracts from notes made of board meetings of 20th July 1904. As I had resigned the previous November I had not access to the records and therefore could only point out a few of the erroneous charges but these were specific enough to illustrate how their game was played.

I have ample other records to show that the charges made by these men, and concurred in through ignorance by the other directors, were made with the object of removing me from the management, getting all power into their own hands, and feathering their own nests at the expense of the company. When I blocked their operations through the charges I made to your Toronto office I rendered the company a great service, but it only repaid me by continuing in force the sentence of extravagance and of being impractical that the others had trumped up. It is impossible to estimate how many thousands of dollars they, if continued in office, would have cost the company, but unmerited punishment was all I derived from my action.

In thinking over our conversation of yesterday I believe it would be advisable for you to show my letters and documents to Mr. Flumerfelt before you interview Mr. Holt again. Mr. Flumerfelt being a director of the Canadian Bank of Commerce his opinion would carry considerable weight with Mr. Holt, and if he breaks the ground for your interview with the latter it may create a more receptive mood. Furthermore Mr. Flumerfelt as Vice President of your company should be made fully acquainted with the situation, and I think your advocacy of my re-instatement would be stronger with all three banks if it was expressed as the wish of the directorate as a whole.

Shortly before we parted you spoke of some probable future development which might interfere with my being re-instated in the general managership. In discussing this with my friends they agree with me that the consideration of possible advantage to the company from any other source should not be allowed to prevent my receiving justice. They pointed out that you would rightly and naturally resent it if the Ontario government, although privately admitting your innocence in the matter of the bond purchase, refused to restore you the possession of the honours, emoluments and reputation their former action deprived you of, simply because they or their associates would profit more from some other course of procedure. And my friends agree that if I am denied re-instatement for similar reasons you will be ignoring the Golden Rule "Do unto others as you would have others do unto you".

Yours sincerely