

1907.

NEW ZEALAND.

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT INQUIRY BOARD

(REPORT OF THE) SET UP UNDER "THE AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT MANUFACTURE,
IMPORTATION, AND SALE ACT, 1905."*Laid on the Table of both Houses of the General Assembly by Leave.*

In the matter of "The Agricultural Implement Manufacture, Importation, and Sale Act 1905," and "The Agricultural Implement Manufacture, Importation, and Sale Extension Act, 1906."

REPORT OF "THE AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT INQUIRY BOARD" on the Complaint in Writing dated the 15th Day of July, 1907, of Cooper and Duncan (Limited), Booth, Macdonald, and Co. (Limited), P. and D. Duncan, Andrews and Beaven, and Reid and Gray.

1. A SITTING of the Board was held in Christchurch on Friday, the 11th day of October, 1907, to inquire into the matter of the said complaint. Mr. Russell and Mr. Johnston appeared as counsel for the complainants; Mr. Harper and Mr. Hunt as counsel for the International Harvester Company; and Mr. Brown for the Massey-Harris Company. Mr. Strigger, K.C., attended to watch the proceedings on behalf of the Hon. the Commissioner of Trade and Customs.

2. Mr. Russell intimated that no evidence would be offered in connection with the Massey-Harris Company; and the allegations in the complaint against that company were withdrawn.

3. Before calling evidence, Mr. Russell asked for a ruling as to the construction of sections 4 and 6 of the Act of 1905—viz., whether, in order to obtain a recommendation from the Board under section 6, it was necessary to prove both the matters mentioned in section 4,—

(1.) A material reduction in price of imported implements, and

(2.) Competition on unfair lines;

or whether it would be sufficient to prove only that the price of any implement imported into New Zealand had been materially reduced. Counsel for all parties agreed that the latter view was the proper one to adopt, and the Board held that in order to entitle the complainants to a recommendation it was not necessary to prove any competition on unfair lines. The evidence of the complainants was confined, therefore, to the question of reduced prices.

4. A transcript of the shorthand notes of the evidence is forwarded with this report.

5. The evidence was directed principally to prove sales at reduced prices of (1) drills, (2) disc harrows, (3) cultivators.

6. We find it proved that drills were sold by the International Harvester Company at materially reduced prices to the following purchasers: viz., Hector McIntosh, farmer, Kaiapoi; John Pethig, farmer, Rangiora; Henry Blackett, farmer, Loburn, near Rangiora; William John Bunting, farmer, Woodend; Martin James Fitzgibbon, farmer, Loburn; Henry Mortimer Keith, farmer, Loburn. In all these cases the drills sold were drills which had been manufactured in the United States of America by the American Seeding Company, and were known in New Zealand as "Osborne" drills.

7. On the evidence as to these particular sales, and on the other evidence adduced, we find that in Canterbury the prices of Osborne drills have been materially reduced by the Harvester Company below those specified in the statement compiled under section 3 of the Act. The evidence as to disc harrows and cultivators is not sufficient to justify a similar finding with regard to those implements.

8. It was proved that the Osborne drills sold by the Harvester Company had been imported into New Zealand by the Osborne Company, which formerly carried on business in New Zealand. The business of that company, with its stock of implements, was taken over by the Harvester Company on the 1st June, 1905—that is to say, nearly five months before the Act was passed—and these drills were all imported before that date.

9. It was admitted by the Harvester Company that these Osborne drills had been sold at reduced prices, and the reasons given for selling them at these prices were that they were old stock

which the company had to get rid of, and that the agency for the Osborne Company's implements had not been given to the Harvester Company.

10. It was proved that the Harvester Company had not itself imported any Osborne drills into New Zealand, and there was no evidence to show that the company had sold any of the implements imported by it into New Zealand at reduced prices, except in the case of the sale of a Deering drill to Arthur Henry Darnley at the price of £41. The price was not below that specified in the statement, but £8 was allowed for an old drill taken over by the company, and this was, no doubt, a very liberal allowance, and may, to the extent to which it was excessive, be regarded as a reduction of price.

11. In view of the fact that the only material reduction in prices proved by the complainants was in connection with Osborne drills which had been imported into New Zealand before the 1st June, 1905, and which were being sold by the Harvester Company as old stock, and concluding that this reduction may be regarded as merely temporary, the Board does not recommend that any relief should be granted to the complainants under the Act.

Dated at Christchurch, this 12th day of October, 1907.

W. A. SIM, Chairman.
JAMES G. WILSON.
W. W. CHARTERS.
A. H. COOPER.
JOSEPH BARUGH.

Approximate Cost of Printing.—Preparation, not given ; printing (1,300 copies), 19s. 6d.

By Authority : JOHN MACKAY, Government Printer, Wellington.—1907.

Price 3d.]