

Can you show any printed authority for that?—If the secretary will write to me at Christchurch and ask for that paper I think I can send it to you.

I shall be glad if you can?—Well, I will.

W. D. Lysnar, of Gisborne, does not know that he made such a statement?—Well, Mr. W. D. Lysnar has made statements just about as true.

Do you see this letter [letter produced]? Your manager, I suppose, sends out correspondence with your knowledge?—Yes. I have never before seen it, but I knew it went.

It is a letter from Armour and Co. to myself, and says, "I have read with much interest your letter to the Minister of Agriculture on the subject of granting a meat-export license to Vestey Bros., as published in the *Gisborne Times* of the 2nd instant. While I do not wish to comment on any particular features of the arguments used by you, I can, as a New-Zealander, heartily concur in the opinion that none but New Zealand interests should be allowed to control our freezing-works to any extent whatever. I think you are incorrect in stating that Vestey Bros.' headquarters are in Chicago, as information we have in this office indicates that they are in Amsterdam." This is a copy?—I have got one.

Do you not think that if there was anything wrong in the statement your manager would have drawn my attention to it when he was writing?—He did.

He only draws attention to the fact that Vestey Bros. have their office in Amsterdam?—I have never seen a pamphlet with more incorrect statements in it than that one.

Then why does he compliment me for it?—I do not know that he did.

He says, "I read with much interest"?—It probably is very interesting to him—very interesting indeed.

*The Chairman*: That does not necessarily imply a compliment.

*Mr. Lysnar*: He says, "I heartily concur in the opinion that none but New Zealand interests should be allowed to control our freezing-works."—Quite right. So do I. You never asked what the real statement was, where you were incorrect. Why do not you ask that?

You were associated with Vestey Bros., were you not?—Never.

Not in Australia?—Never.

Another Carney?—Another Carney, perhaps.

A relative of yours?—No. I have not a brother in Australasia.

You say there are more packing-places outside Chicago than in it?—Yes, more packing plants outside Chicago than in Chicago.

You mean more slaughtering-places in America outside Chicago than in Chicago?—Yes.

And meat is railed from all parts of the United States to them?—Not all parts. Meat in America is railed to the nearest packing-place, unless the producer thinks he can get a better price in Chicago than at Omaha or St. Paul.

Does not meat come to Chicago three thousand miles?—If a man sends it that far he has a perfect right to do it. If he thinks Chicago will be the best market that week he sends there. He sends it where he likes.

I think you said the average of the stock coming there comes about eleven hundred miles?—I should think that is about right.

You say that Mr. Armour did not give evidence before the Federal Trade Commission?—Yes.

He had the same right as any one else, I suppose?—No packers ever had that right.

Do you know if he applied?—No; but the Commission's findings were closed up without one packer being asked to give evidence.

But you are not aware whether he applied or not?—No.

You say, "We have not done anything wrong" in connection with the trade. For whom do you speak then as "we"? You say also, "We ship to our own houses"?—Yes.

Whom do you mean by "our own houses"?—Our agents: Armour and Co. of London, or of America, or of anywhere else. We intend to ship to our own houses. That would be the natural outlet for our stuff. But if we can get any more from Jim Jones or John Brown I am going to get it.

You regard your houses as Armour and Co., selling all over the globe?—Yes. "Our" houses—not "mine."

You say "our houses" in that sense?—I mean Armour and Co.'s houses in other parts of the world.

When you say "We have never done anything wrong," you refer there to Armour and Co.?—I refer to Armour and Co. of Australia (Limited).

Armour and Co. of Australia are only started, and have not had a chance?—Well, let us have a chance.

You do not include Armour and Co. of the world?—No; absolutely no.

Why did the London authorities appoint you and other representatives of Armour and Co. to do certain things? Are you not aware that Sir James Robinson is the Controller of the meat question in England for the Imperial authorities?—I understand it.

Are you not aware that Sir James Robinson acted as agent for Armour and Co.?—I am not aware of that fact.

Would you deny it? Did you not make that statement to the Meat Trust Committee in 1917?—I do not think so.

That Sir James Robinson represented Birt and Co., who acted as agents for Armour and Co.?—I do not think I ever made any such statement.

Do you deny that Armour and Co. and Sir James Robinson are associated through Birt and Co.?—To the best of my knowledge and belief that is not so.

You are Washington Irvine Carney, I suppose?—Whom do I look like?

Listen to this: "If you will allow me for a moment to revert to the Birt question, I will say that Birt and Co. are associated with Armour and Co."—I think I can explain that.

Wait a moment—"with Armour and Co. in the relation of buyer and seller. Armour and Co. handle Birt's products on the London market. At present they are handling nothing but the offal, as the Imperial Government has taken over the Australian supply. That is the extent to which any Armour name is connected with Birt and Co., as their London agents." *Question*: All Birt and