

64. Do you know if many rugs are imported into New Zealand?—I do not.

65. Do you think there are?—I say I do not know, and it is far better for me to say I do not know than to make a statement which might be erroneous.

66. Is it within your knowledge that the Wellington company turn out a rug at from 13s. to 14s. which is better than can be imported at the price?—If it is so, it only bears out my contention that if they can turn out goods which are required in the colony they can do the business without more protection.

67. You say that you are a Free-trader out-and-out?—Yes.

68. If you are a Free-trader out-and-out and are here largely in the interests of the manufacturers of imported goods, how do you propose to keep up your log so that the workers can earn sufficient money to live in New Zealand?—You cannot take the duty off one article alone. I am not an advocate for taking off the duty in one industry.

69. You do not know how you would keep up your log so that the workers may earn sufficient money to live in New Zealand?—The moment we talk about producing goods in this colony to compete with the imported article the workers immediately say the cost of living is so high that they cannot produce at the price. The cost of living is high owing to the enormous duties that are levied.

70. As a colonist, do you advocate taking the duties off these goods?—No, unless the duty is taken off other imports.

71. You think the duty is fair and reasonable?—Yes.

72. Would you rather make up goods from wool grown in the colony than from material produced in France and other continental countries?—Yes, as a colonist.

73. And as the father of a number of babies you would prefer to see them clothed in New Zealand clothing?—Yes, and if our cost of living were largely reduced we should be able to see them so clothed.

74. You told us that shoddy was not necessarily confined to the inferior class of goods?—Yes; they cannot make goods without a little shoddy in them.

75. You think that the finer class of goods from the west of England contains it?—Yes.

76. What is "shoddy"?—It is derived from the word "sheddy." It is what is shed from the loom while weaving. It is also made up from woollen clippings from the tailors, which are put into a machine and brought back to a fibrous state, then respun into yarn.

77. It might be made from old garments?—Yes; but it goes through such a purification that you cannot tell that it comes from old garments.

78. Then, "shoddy" might be made of all wool as of any other material?—Yes, "shoddy" is nothing else but wool.

79. Would you approve of a trade-mark being placed on imported goods to show that they are made of pure wool or that they contain "shoddy" or are made of cotton or a mixture of wool and cotton?—I should certainly approve of anything being put on a garment to show that it was a mixture, but not that it was shoddy, because "shoddy" covers such an amount of ground that no one in the world could say that there was or was not shoddy in any goods, and, if so, how much.

80. Could you not tell under a microscope?—No.

81. In the manufactures in which there is shoddy is the texture as long as in goods manufactured of pure wool?—No, but they cannot get at it. Certainly it is not.

82. If I got it under a microscope could I not tell the length of the texture?—Yes.

83. And is it not largely on account of the shortness of the texture that the deterioration takes place?—No.

84. Is it not a fact that in shoddy goods there is a large quantity of jute?—No, that is not so.

85. It has not come within your knowledge that there is a large quantity of jute used in shoddy goods?—No.

86. The evidence of manufacturers who have come here is to the effect that jute is largely used in shoddy goods?—Let me qualify what I say because I am not a manufacturer of goods. There is nothing that I know of but wool used in the imported goods except cotton.

87. Generally speaking, is not the term "shoddy" applied to cheap cotton mixed goods that are got up to deceive the public?—They might be got up in that form, but you cannot say what "shoddy" means. Some people call the "shoddy" "cotton and wool."

88. Would you call it that?—No. Anybody can tell when there is cotton in goods.

89. You would approve of a trade-mark being used to show what goods contain shoddy and what do not?—No; I would have them marked "Union goods," not "Shoddy."

90. Would it not be an improvement for the mills in England if the goods that came out here were branded so as to show those that are pure silk and those that are not pure silk?—Yes; but I would have them marked "Union goods" if they contained silk and any other mixture.

91. You know that imitation silks come from the East and that there is a good deal of difficulty in distinguishing them?—Yes.

92. Would it not be well if we had a trade-mark in order to distinguish them?—Yes.

93. *The Chairman.*] You said that there were four hundred thousand pounds' worth of woollen goods imported?—Yes.

94. Is not that estimate very far out—is it not nearer one million pounds' worth?—On page 187 of the Year-book woollen piece-goods are put down at £400,020, while blankets are put down at £8,504.

95. What about the five hundred thousand pounds' worth of slop goods imported?—Yes, but we have under discussion the piece-goods.

96. Were you not alluding to the goods you make up into suits?—Those do not come under the heading "slop goods."

97. Was it fair to say there were only four hundred thousand pounds' worth of woollen goods imported when you qualify it now by saying you referred to piece-goods? The impression you left on