

blackguarding of American industry hurts all of us, for it is reiterated everywhere, and generally is given a most adverse and unfair interpretation. We hope before long that the farmer will appreciate the identity of his interests, and will unite to bring us closer together. The bulk of the accusations made against the alleged trust are made by men who are simply throwing dust in the eyes of both the Government and the farmers by pointing their fingers at us while they are doing exactly what they accuse us of wanting to do. All we ask is a square deal, and in return we will give the same. Armour and Co. are in the meat business, have been for many years, and undoubtedly will be for many years to come, and if Armour and Co. are refused the privilege of exporting for themselves they will have to get it through some other channel, which means middlemen and lower prices to the producer. We have made every effort to be fair to our competitors, and have complied with all the laws of the Government; capital has been invested and the company organized under New Zealand legal requirements; and surely we should not be discriminated against, but should have an equal opportunity of existing along with other companies similarly organized. That we have been discriminated against is due to the efforts of middlemen who operate in the London and New Zealand markets, and others, complaining of the nationality of the company's principal stockholder. In America, since the war, many English companies have established themselves there, but the American packers do not say, "Keep the English companies out of the meat trade in the United States"—on the contrary, they welcome them there; and surely the New Zealand Government are not going to exclude American companies from doing business in New Zealand. In every English-speaking country where Armour and Co. operate 99 per cent. of their staff are Britishers, and surely these Britishers are not so unpatriotic that they would see the best interests of their country sacrificed. In the districts throughout New Zealand where there are fatteners of stock and where we have done business they are quite in accord with us having a license, and the districts which have been opposed to us are really dairying districts and men we have never come in contact with. If the American Government were afraid of Armour and Co. why did they appoint me financial representative in 1918 in their wool-purchase between the Imperial and United States Governments? Also, why did the London Board of Trade allow me to inspect the purchases of lamb which have recently been shipped to the United States? Further, why did the Imperial Government appoint Mr. J. S. Carpenter, of Armour and Co. (Limited), London, to inspect the damage done to meat throughout the works in New Zealand? Although Armour and Co. do not ask for a killing license, I can say from the bottom of my heart that if they desired and were allowed to operate works in New Zealand that the Dominion would never regret it, as with the expert knowledge and facilities they have for handling by-products they could pay the producer far more than they can at present for his stock. The handling of the by-products in the meat business has developed to a greater degree than any other interests, and it is the utilization of these by-products which enables Armour and Co. to buy and sell the meat on such a small margin of profit. They make more money out of these by-products than they do out of the meat which they buy and sell; whereas here in New Zealand it is the reverse, and there are few companies who use the by-products to any extent, but allow them to be thrown away. As illustration of what our competitors have done we give the following: In April, 1917, the Association of Colonial Meat Salesmen in London, who had handled practically the entire New Zealand output, got together and attacked us throughout New Zealand so as to influence the New Zealand Government to take some action. They, with several middlemen and other interested parties throughout New Zealand, were instrumental in having the Slaughtering and Inspection Act amended in December, 1918. We do not think these men were prompted by any desire to benefit New Zealand; in fact, we do not believe more than one or two of them have ever really paid the New Zealand producer one penny, but have taken out a great deal in commissions. They know that our methods mean their elimination; and we cannot see why the producer should sell his meat to be handled by these middlemen, who render them no service of value. It is probably because some of these middlemen are of the old school that the New Zealand meat business has not progressed more than it has to-day. As an instance of what took place at the time when this combined agitation was going on against us, M. A. Elliott, of Mellsop, Elliott, and Co., Palmerston North, started to do business with Armour and Co. (Limited) of London, but at the same time they were agents for Gilbert Anderson and Co.—in fact, were owned by Gilbert Anderson. On learning that Mellsop, Elliott, and Co. were doing business with Armour and Co. (Limited), London, Gilbert Anderson cabled them that if they had any further transactions with Armours, that all their letters of credit would be withdrawn. All business relations with Armours was immediately stopped, and Mr. Elliott, in order to regain the graces of his principals, edited a pamphlet entitled "The Meat Trust Menace," which was circulated broadcast throughout New Zealand. This will clearly show from whence comes the agitation against my company. Mr. Elliott was quite willing to do business with Armour and Co. just as long as he could use Armours' money, but when we wanted to do business direct with the farmers we were a menace. It is a fact that in 1919 American companies handled only 34 per cent. of the world's output of meat, but we never hear very much about the other 66 per cent. Who handles that? This point alone should convince members of the Committee that the American packers have in no way got control of the meat-output of the world. It is our belief, in view of the world shortage of meat-supplies, that any action which tends to dislocate the best channels of the meat trade will result unfavourably to the producers in New Zealand. Would it not be wiser in the interests of New Zealand, instead of shutting out direct-buying customers, to grant this license and deal with us, instead of American buyers of meat having to go to London markets to purchase the same goods through commission men, as in the past? It certainly must make New Zealand products dearer to the American customer, and less profitable to the New Zealander producer, to have to buy them in the round-about method that has been the order up till now. If at any time it was proved we were doing anything that was detrimental to the interests of the producers in New Zealand, or to any other commercial interests, it would then be within reason for the Government to take away this license. To misjudge such a finely adjusted organization as Armour and Co. would be to turn back the hands of the clock of progress. In support of my evidence I attach the following: "Testimony of J. Ogden Armour before the Committee on Inter-State and Foreign Commerce"; "The Chicago Packing Industry," by J. Ogden Armour; "The Truth about the American Meat Trust," by W. Irving