155. Mr. Waymouth could get the information from him?—Possibly.

156. Mr. Waymouth also said the practice of selling New Zealand meat as English is really not against New Zealand. He says the people who now buy it as English would not otherwise buy it at all, and therefore the price would not be so good. Mr. Waymouth's contention is that it helps New Zealand. What is your opinion?—With all respect to Mr. Waymouth, I beg to differ from him. I have made considerable inquiry and study on this subject on the market at Home, and I am positive that Mr. Waymouth is wrong. If properly introduced to those people, they will take our meat as New Zealand meat.

157. *Mr. Buchanan.*] Do you think, Mr. Cameron, that the shilling luncheon-rooms in London, where hundreds of thousands of mutton-chop lunches are supplied, are not largely supplied from the best class of New Zealand frozen mutton?—I really do not know the shops to which you refer.

158. *The Chairman.*] Do you not think the Agent-General takes an interest in that matter? Do you not think it would be a commendable thing if New-Zealanders could be able to go into a restaurant and get a New Zealand chop?—I think it would be a very commendable thing if not only New-Zealanders but every one else could do so.

159. *Mr. Buchanan.*] Is it not a fact that hundreds of thousands of shilling luncheons are partaken of by business-men in the City who have no time for more elaborate luncheons?—If you came to London and asked me where I could get you a respectable shilling luncheon I could not take you to such a place. I do not know the places to which you refer.

160. *Mr. Hardy.*] You never considered it part of your business as Produce Commissioner to go round London asking for a New Zealand chop?—I have often asked in hotels and restaurants for New Zealand meat, and also for New Zealand butter and cheese; but they did not tell me it was New Zealand mutton if they had it.

161. *Mr. Duthie.*] I understand that the numerous brands on our sheep, and the numerous small shipments, cause unnecessary delay in sorting them out in the docks, and also injury to the mutton in some instances, besides the general obstruction of the work; and that as against that the Argentine ships coming in with one brand can go straight on with their work?—Yes; and the same with Nelson Bros.' direct shipments.

162. You stated two causes of evil, but you stopped short in your remedy?—It is in my report—the concentration of supplies.

163. What does that mean—it is a good old phrase: do you mean to abolish the small shippers?—If you turn to my report, paragraph 5, page 2, you will see the explanation of that matter.

164. What is your remedy for the evils you complain of?—The damage that occurs in sorting to marks in the hold arises from the fact that there are numerous small shippers who send Home their individual consignments to different agents.

165. I admit all that, but that being the case, and you have given us what the Argentine do, how do you propose that Parliament should provide a remedy—what is the remedy proposed?—I suggest that these numerous shippers send their consignments under one brand, each class, of course, being under a different subsection, and that they all be sent to one agent. This would save the sorting of marks considerably at the other end, and so reduce the damage.

FRIDAY, 7TH AUGUST, 1903.

Examination of Mr. H. C. CAMERON continued. (No. 5.)

1. *The Chairman.*] We propose to take evidence this morning in connection with the insurance, cold-storage, and distribution of meat.

2. *Mr. Harding.*] With reference to damaged meat, you say: "I have occasionally heard of claims being made on sheep which I had seen delivered from the ship, and which I was satisfied were then in perfect condition." How do you propose to deal with that?—I think that is a matter to which the shippers in the colony should draw the attention of the underwriters at Home. They ought to take, I consider, more precaution to see that the damage that occurs is as little as possible.

3. What about proving it—that is the difficulty, it seems to me?—No proof, as far as I know, is required. That is why I urge that the insurance companies should look after their interests better.

4. You say, "I have found that damage had been occasioned after the mutton had left the ship, and while in transit to the stores." Is the insurance supposed to cover the meat until it is taken delivery of?—The insurance policy is in force until thirty days after the arrival of the vessel in London.

5. Then if it is taken delivery of before that the insurance still holds good?—When the meat is discharged from the vessel it can be railed in a van or placed in a lighter and taken to the cold-store, and until thirty days after its arrival the insurance still holds good for any damage.

6. *Mr. Hogg.*] The insurance companies simply allow the claims to go by default, without properly supervising the meat and caring for it after it is landed?—The insurance companies do not supervise the meat during discharge from the ship.

Mr. Harding: That points to the fact that the insurance is too heavy, and that, if properly supervised, it could be kept down.

7. *Mr. Hogg.*] Do you think if the policy of insurance were altered so that it should not cover the meat for such an extended time it would lead to any beneficial effect?—If the policy of insurance merely covered the meat until discharged from the vessel, and a new policy had to be taken out to cover damage afterwards, I think that would be the means of insuring more care being taken to see that damage did not occur.