

Co.'s stuff is consigned to Armour and Co. of London?" *Answer*: "From Australia, yes." *Question*: "Does this arrangement apply to New Zealand?" *Answer*: "No, sir." *Question*: "Is it not a fact that Birt and Co. own the Ocean Beach Freezing-works?" *Answer*: "Yes, I think that is recognized to be the fact." You acknowledge there that Armour and Co. were associated with Birt and Co.?—Armour and Co. were appointed agents for Birt and Co.'s offals for two years. They handled them for two years after the commandeering.

The statement made before the Meat Export Trade Committee was correct—that they were associated. Your statement now is that they were not?—I say they were associated. I still say so.

And they acted in the capacity of agents between them?—Armour and Co. of London were agents for Birt and Co.'s offals in London. That is the only way in which they were associated, and that does not now exist.

At that time you had Mr. M. W. Kingdon?—He was then general manager.

What has happened to him?—I do not know. He may be dead, for all I know.

How did he come to leave the firm?—I do not know.

Are you not aware that Sir James Robinson controls Birt and Co.?—No, I am not.

Well, if he did, would it surprise you that that accounts for the meat of those associated with Armour and Co. getting preference in these matters?—I do not know anything about it.

If I could produce a copy of Birt and Co.'s share-list showing Sir James Robinson's name?—If you do I shall be convinced, but I do not know that.

You know that Birt, Potter, and Hughes, of London, are the principal owners of Birt and Co.?—I am not aware of that.

You say that the New Zealand works allow the by-products to be thrown away: is that fair?—I think so. I think the bulk of them are thrown away. When one sees what Armour and Co. of Chicago do with the by-products I think it is fair to say that the bulk of the New Zealand by-products are wasted. I am not talking of the fat, or the pelts, or that sort of thing. I am talking about the intestines, the hearts and livers, and that sort of thing, that go into the manure-heap—some of the best food in the world.

You said you sold all that meat to the Imperial Government?—Yes.

Do you know if Armour and Co. bought meat in England from Sir James Robinson, through the Imperial authorities, and then resold to the Imperial authorities?—No, I do not.

Can you account for meat being taken off in the trenches with the tags of Armour on it?—I can account for that easily.

Well, how is that?—Well, we killed meat here in New Zealand which went out of New Zealand bearing Armour's tags. It is very simple. Armour's tags were on every carcase that went out of New Zealand for about a year, and that meat was sold to the Imperial Government with the Armour tags on it. Later on some of your friends in London and Sir James Robinson got together and said, "We will do away with this part of the advertising; we will cut the tags off." For eighteen months we had to put a circled "A" on the tags, instead of the word "Armour."

You say that accounts for it?—I do not say that accounts for it, but it is my solution of it. I do not believe Sir James Robinson ever sold Armour and Co. any meat. That is my own opinion. In fact, the London salesmen saw to that.

Are you not aware that Sir James Robinson is selling to the dealers at Home?—I think he is, but not to Armour and Co. or Swift and Co. No American companies in the country were able to buy any New Zealand stuff. All they could handle outside British firms was just some stuff that was nominated for them.

Have you any definite information that none was sold?—No, I have not.

*Mr. Hawken*: Under present conditions, you think the by-products could be handled to better advantage?—Yes. In New Zealand the companies take only the meat, the tails, the pelts, the hides, and the wool. They pay for the fat, and handle their tallow.

Do you propose to handle by-products?—Not in New Zealand.

Of course, the works being scattered, the handling of the by-products is done at a disadvantage?—That is so.

Do you think the present works could handle the by-products better than they do at the present time?—Yes.

*Mr. Field*: Do you think you are suffering from your present difficulty with respect to the issue of an export license by reason of the fact that you came into the open and used the name of Armour and Co.?—I am nearly certain of that.

Do you state that there are no other American packers connected with New Zealand concerns?—I do not think there is one.

You say there is still competition satisfactory to the producers in South America?—Yes, I understand that from Mr. Donaldson, whom I met in Christchurch. He assured me that that was the fact—that the Argentine producers to-day are getting much more for their stuff than they did. He said it was owing to the fact that the American packers came to the Argentine and put up large works there.

What proportion of the trade in South America is done by the American companies?—I think, 59 per cent.

And you say there are British companies operating there to-day?—Yes, British and Argentine companies.

With regard to taxation, you say the reason you have paid none is that you made losses till recently?—Yes. We made losses for two years. In 1918 we made a profit, from which we put aside £8,000, and next year we will pay on the profit we will make this year. I wish it was twice as much, because it only shows my ability to run the concern.

Could you tell the Committee in what way the issue of an export license to you would assist in developing and extending our markets elsewhere? Would it be because you are in touch with, though not in business association with, Armour's concerns in other parts of the world?—I believe that is so—that our competition in other parts of the world will bring you better markets. It will sharpen up the people who have had you under their control for fifteen years, so that they will have to put better methods into their operations. It was not because small concerns in America were grabbing