22nd September 1921.

R. E. Clanton, Esq.,

Bonnieville, Ore.

Dear Mr Clanton;-

I returned to the city this morning after an absence of a week and found your lettergram of the 18th, awaiting my arrival. I sent you a lettergram in reply, stating I would mail you copy of a newspaper article of Babcock's and would write you in reference to the conference you proposed.

You will see from Babcock's interview that he has just covered the ground you went over and I thought it would be an advantage to you to know his remarks before making up your report. You will obsetve he harps back to his hard and fast theory -despite everything to the contrary - that the only way to restore the fishery is by an absolute closure. Outside of the futility of depending on Nature reversing every past performance known to history, it is a pure waste of time to talk of an absolute closure. This would mean practical confiscation of the investment of capital in canning establishments and of fishermen in boats and fishing gear, and no government, on this side of the line at least,would take such action.

Furthermore Babcock's own reports, as well as those of the Dominion government, show that in the Birkenhead-Lillooet section, as well as in Pitt and Cultus Lakes, there has been no dimunition in the runs, on the contrary that to the former area was in 1920 the greatest ever recorded. An absolute closure would have to be made to permit the upper Fraser runs to get by, but this would also prevent catching the lower Fraser runs that admitedly do not require the same amount of protection. It would be as unnecessary to interfere with the latter runs as it would be to close all fishing on the lower Columbia to insure a run of Chinooks ascending to the upper waters to the Snake and Spokane tributaries. It would not only be unnecessary, but futile to expect that those upper waters would derive any benefit through the runs to lower Columbia river spawning beds not being fished.

I therefore think that your report should specifically refer to the recommendation that a total closure is necessary or that it would accomplish any real good. If we are to make any progress in our efforts to get the financial backing of the general public as well

as those actually interested in the industry, it is essential that the arguments raised against our plans should be specifically dealt with instead of allowing them to pass unchallenged.

And this brings me back to the matter of the Seattle conference you propose. And what I now have to say I wish you to treat absolutely confidential. I have every respect for Mr. O'Malley's ability, sincerity, earnestness and honesty of opinion, but I think you expressed to me while here that you thought scientists did not give sufficient consideration to the ideas and discoveries of practical men, and although I may be greatly mistaken, I attribute a somewhat similar viewpoint to Mr. O'Malley. Perhaps I am wrong, but I base this opinion largely upon the apparent lack of effort on his part to join you in your journey to the upper Fraser, and also upon his suggestion to me that before such a trip be made the opinion of Mr. Babcock be obtained. It struck me at the time that an expert should first visit the field so as to obtain an unbiased impression, and consult others after their own investigations were completed. What I and my associates were striving for was a disinterested report and recommendations, not a corroboration - or even a criticism - of Mr. Babcock's viewpoint. It is unreasonable to suppose Mr. O'Malley's opinion would not be influenced to some extent by Mr. Babcock's remarks, and with all due respect for the latter gentleman, it was not his opinion, but Mr. O'Malley's own that we were after.

I think therefore that before a meeting is arranged at which the Washington authorities are invited to be present, it would be best to have you and O'Malley get together and discuss the situation. Whether I should be present or not is another question. Possibly the discussion between you would be freer and franker if only the two of you were present. But if you think it advisable that I should be on hand for your first interview I will arrange to do so. What I am anxious to avoid is having a meeting with any outsiders present who might get the impression that you and O'Malley were not unanimous, and who would therefore abandon all efforts to restore the fishery because the experts could not agree upon the proper course to recommend. If any differences of opinion should develope between the two of you when alone these could be thrashed out, or compromised, before meeting others in conference. Then a harmonious open conference could follow, and with only beneficial results to be looked for.

Under the circumstances I will await ~~further~~ word from you before proceeding further in the matter. If you want me let me know and we will arrange a suitable date. Do you know whether O'Malley has returned from Alaska yet ? We should, if possible, try and meet the Washington State authorities immediately after the preliminary conference is concluded. If you think my idea of you and O'Malley first meeting alone is a good one you could do this and advise me afterwards when to go down. Possibly three meetings might be advisable, first you and he alone, then the three of us, and lastly ~~a third~~ one at which the State Commissioners would be present.

Yours sincerely

HD/P.