384

April 1st 1904

Dear Dd;-

I am giving a letter of introduction to you to a Mr E.W. Rollins of Thos. E. H. Rollins & Sons - Boston and San Francisco and if you can consistently do so I would esteem it a favor if you could give him some good advice on salmon packing. It would have to be done in a quiet way as being what the Alaska Packers Ass'n have by experience found to be most profitable, and if incidentally you could let him know the esteem as a salmon packer in which Ewen is held it would not be amiss.

Of course you know that there are a large number of conflicting interests in the B.C. Packers Ass'n the two principal ones being the Wilson faction and the faction represented by Murray and R.P. Rithet & Co. To the latter end Mr Rollins - who is the largest preference shareholder - has attached himself. Both the Wilson and Murray ends in order to lend force to their representations have posed as possessing the requisite amount of technical knowledge to operate the company to the best advantage and as neither side can get Ewen to support in the slightest of their particular plan they offset this by damning him with faint praise. They say he has been a good packer but he is now too old and should be retired; that his ideas are not feasible because he cannot see things from their standpoint and that the company should superannuate him. In years Ewen is probably old enough to be a father to anyone of them, but his ideas are far more businesslike and clear than all theirs combined and he has forgotten more about the business than they ever knew.

The principal trouble I found with the Packers was due to the entire board with the exception of Ewen being composed of men who lacked technical knowledge of the industry and as I say Ewen's advice was not given proper credit. Mr Rollins while here had the

#2

ideas of all the others, but did not take the trouble to learn Ewen's opinion, and as a result he has gone away imbued with the idea that Murray's view of the question is correct.

Murray's plan of management is to have practically one man manage everything — and that one to be Mr Kee of Ritchet & Co's office. The entire office work, the selling, etc., he is to do. He will also manage the plant, arrange for shipping etc. Of course there will be employees under him to do the drudgery part, but his will be the sole directing mind. It would be like you or Mr Portman undertaking all that you, he, Hirsch, and Dore are doing to-day. By this condensing of management a saving in salaries is to be made but they cannot see it would probably be more than offset by the loss through inefficiency.

The plan of district managers I got from your company's example where you have Johnson, Jensen, Wange and probably others managing two or more plants. This they now declare unnecessary and extravagant and want to have each individual cannery report direct to the General manager who is supposed to be able to guide and direct them in addition to the multitude of other matters that lay under his duties. If you could I would like you to show the absurdity of this plan, and you could illustrate its effects by pointing out that such wholesale shearing as they contemplate will result in every good practical man they have retiring from their employ. They have already broken up Whatcom's district with the result that he was promptly offered and accepted a position from one of others and the Co's have thus lost one of their best men. Ewen sees the folly of their idea but he is not consulted in the matter.

Personally I am out of it, and having in company with Winch purchased the Herman Cannery on

#3

the Skeena, I have no selfish interest in the matter. I would not want any hand in the management of the B.C. Packers unless a most radical change was instituted in their entire system. The company I consider to be in good shape and while the present policy will retard their progress and invite competition the error of the present ideas will eventually be perceived and a more business like policy adopted. But at the same time while in this sense being a disinterested party myself, I have two good reasons for wishing shareholders like Rollins set right. First, I hold a large block of stock which I want to see pay dividends. And Second, I am responsible for all the canners who took shares, and in Evans's case especially I am deeply interested for his faith in the Ass'ns success. Under proper management was so great he took all his pay in stock, and to have his faith thus treated by people ignorant of the company's real welfare and to have his practical knowledge discarded for the theoretical ideas of mere dabblers in the business is the part that galls me.

Murray for some personal reasons seems unalterably opposed to Balfour Guthrie & Co, and for that reason wants to see them cut out of the number of our agents. I on the other hand would like to see the whole account in B.G. & Co's hands and believe that if it was done it would put many more thousands of dollars in the Assn's coffers each year. The success of his plan will mean the elimination of B.G. & Co from the agents, their share probably going to Gardiner & Co and Wolfch Ackerley & Co (the latter are absolutely useless) and as Murray is equally opposed to Evans who is B.G. & Co's local agent, it will also exclude B.G. & Co from all chances for tin plate, etc. orders, and from the shipping business.

Of course you understand it will take time to make these changes that I am opposed to, and

164

then only if the majority shareholders are influenced to Murray's way of thinking. Rollins is a follower of his to say but if he saw the other side he might have his opinion altered. I only saw him for an hour or so and told him I would give him a letter to you and thought through talking with an independent party he might obtain different impressions than it would be safe to form from the more or less self interested stories he would hear in this section

I would also like him to meet Mr Portman if possible, and learn his views. So that Mr Portman will be apprised of the situation you can advise him as to what I have said but I would not like it to go beyond you two. It may seem strange I should write thus to a competing corporation, but not only do I consider that the different selling fields preclude competition, but I write as a friend of B.G.& Co whom I know you also would like to see come out with the sole agency of the R.C.A. Above all I write as one friend of Everin's to another of his friends, feeling that I can count on you to combat any adverse comments on his ability, which less knowing and less discerning men have made concerning him.

With regards to all my S.P. friends

Very sincerely

Henry Doyle