


From

RID#63



RECEIVED  
VP PROGRAM  
MARITIMES

MAR 13 A 10:11

To M. Donovan  
Supr.

March 3, 63

Regional Supr.  
Navigation Water Protection  
Canadian Coast Guard  
Dept of Fisheries and Oceans  
Foot of Parker St. Box 1000  
Dartmouth, N.S.

I will write again  
if I ever get to  
see the Navigation  
Water Act.

Dear Regional Supr. Donovan,

I am writing on behalf of myself and my family.  
[Redacted] the 3 of

as long time residents of Digby Neck and Little River  
the Towne property is [Redacted] to the property of John Johnson  
et al, near the property to be quarried at Little River, White's  
Cove section. Our children and grandchildren total more than  
I can count - and are seasonal settlers. [Redacted] also  
owns property very very close to the quarry site as does my  
daughter [Redacted]. Our own seasonal residents also  
include 2 other sons of my sister and 2 other children of mine.  
Our grandchildren (mine) include [Redacted]  
[Redacted]. Grand children are many - My [Redacted]  
is expected here this summer. She is [Redacted] old. She is Canada's future  
We care, about Little River, and view the 'quarry - Wharf  
M. [Redacted] I hope I will still  
[Redacted] for years to come. SHE IS MY FUTURE  
[Redacted]

Situation as anathema to us. If you know this area - you will quickly understand. If you don't, then I don't know what to say except, please get to know our world - It is unique. And wonderful (Not for long of this what goes on)

As far as my views, I don't know if they will have any effect on your thinking, But I will try to explain

1. I don't see putting the cart before the horse. i.e. I do not think it correct for you to put in a what since there is no need for me. The need would be based on a large quarry, and that approval, so far as I know, has not yet been openly given. It may never be given. Pshaw, God!
2. Common sense is more basic than anything else. there is none here
  - a. It is not logical to destroy a beautiful area which is rare in this world, one of Canada's beauties. It is not logical to destroy its <sup>habitat</sup> ~~habitat~~ riches.
  - b. It is not logical to destroy Canada for the gratification of another country. Or for certain individuals.
  - c. It is <sup>UNDER-HANDED</sup> underhanded not to give a solid background check to the companies involved in this quarry - <sup>about</sup> ~~about~~ situations. When you do, if you ever do, you will realize that they do not have the interests of Canada in mind. That includes the

3 / Great Lakes Company whose name I mentioned  
carefully on TV last night. The huge ship the  
family company owns, and which is a self-leader  
would be efficient in destroying our fish habitat.

The main family company involved in the quarry - which  
[you cannot in conscience separate the quarry  
from the wharf, as you need the both to operate  
the business] that company is only here because  
New Jersey people were horrified by their destruction  
of the N.J. coastline & changed the law. They are  
personnel now justice in N.J. So why would  
Canada want N.J. rejects? That's what they are,  
by all info I can gather.

What info have you gathered? To date, I've heard of some  
in Florida? What do you know about the Clayton activities  
legal suit against the Chubb Ins. Co. of Warren  
N.J.? Why would one sue one's own insurance co.?  
Why did they name my son [redacted] on that suit?  
He has the same name as my [redacted]  
[redacted] is he is the son  
I will write again if I ever can get  
the Narasimha Waters Act. Why can't you

4. Why we need a copy? / do not have internet.

I have looked Canada for some [redacted]  
Why let them do this to me, and others?  
Why do it to your own country? Why sell it out for \$?  
Please - make this act arrestable

I congress what it says -  
You should not destroy the fishing - It is doing well It is here. Has been used by residents since before the Amer. Rev. I count the [redacted] as residents. They are real people, and the

some needs I have. And you have  
Clayton destroy the sand under the water  
where fish whisk as babies - that is their part -  
Do not let them do it here. (They are reformed you think?)  
Laws are meant to protect. In their absence, in order COORS  
we have British Common Law. A thinking, reasonable  
person must believe that it is wrong to destroy  
fish and you is. That is low. That is the  
15th | the absence of legislated law. I do know by  
Respectful [redacted] [redacted]

Re the Wharf again

ps. I'm sure you must know that every time there is the eradication of one species of living things, it is an immediate or future loss to mankind.

The loss of the very endangered right whale would be despicable, since there is great knowledge of what would happen. Their approximate no of 300 is maintained with difficulty. Numbers are carefully counted. It is a fact, a proven fact, that the Bay of Fundy is the only right whale nursery. Babies are brought here to mature.

encounters danger in shipping lanes all over the world - We don't need to kill them off completely that would be a disaster.

Canada seems sometimes to care about its reputation in the world - they like to consider themselves peacekeepers.

any species is not worthy of peace keepers. Other whales exist here, too, and have different patterns. Killing the young of whales is not worthy of peace keepers. We should work to maintain the Fur seal herd, esp now they are being trained against terrorists. ... are some new ...