charges, interest and depreciation (10 per cent.), £170; casks, bags, bagging, &c. (at £1 per ton), £157; contingencies (at 10 per cent.), £137: total, £1,504. Revenue: 3,000 tons of wool, yielding, say, 4½ per cent. potassium carbonate—157½ tons at £15 per ton, £2,367; less cost of production, £1,504 = £863. Thus this potash-recovery plant costing £1,700 should pay an annual dividend of 50 per cent. on the initial cost, and wages to workmen of £450 per year. The potash in our 1916 clip, which was a small one, amounted to 4,650 tons, and, taking it at its pre-war price, £15 per ton (present price is about £400 per ton), represented a value of £69,750, all of which was lost to this Dominion. For the purposes of the above calculations the values of the product have been based on normal prices. It has also been assumed that the expenditure involved in the production of potash is all additional cost; but, as the dirtiest wool is richest in potash, it could all be put through the steeping-machine, and thereby do away with all the preliminary hand picking now adopted when scouring some classes of wool.

These notes have been collected from various sources—"The Wool Year-book," "The New Zealand Official Year-book," "Bulletin of Department of Chemistry, S.A.," &c.—backed by personal experience of the writer in the manufacture of lanoline as samples here shown, and they will, I trust, be of interest to this Committee and of value to the Dominion. The following is an analysis of sample of lanoline by the Dominion Analyst, dated 15th January, 1918: "Moisture, 2·7 per cent.; ash, 0·065 per cent.; unsaponifiable matter, 44 per cent.; acid value, 3·25 per cent.; saponification value, 103 per cent.; iodine value, 9·4 per cent.; Reichert-Meisse value, 0·6 per cent. The sample is of good quality, and of very good colour and appearance.—J. T. MACLAURIN, Dominion Analyst."

WILLIAM KINDER, Chemist, examined.

To Mr. Hornsby: I favour the prohibition of the export of greasy wool. We have experimented, and we now have a marketable article. We do not find a ready market for the second-quality grades. The market is not worked up. We expect to find a market for the lanoline. There is a 33⅓-per-cent. tariff against us in Australia. We have not opened up trade with America, but are in communication with it.

To Mr. Luke: We have a sufficient plant to handle the lanoline. From the evidence I think that lanoline has not been used to the extent that you would expect. If the prohibition of unscoured wool were put into operation it would not affect the export of wool.

To Mr. Hudson: Some of the machinery we have obtained in New Zealand. The local foundry has made upwards of £100 worth very satisfactorily. We would have an outlet in New Zealand for all the grease turned out, but not for all the lanoline. Importation would not be a handicap on our work with the duty now levied.

To Mr. Craigie: We employ two men. I think all the wool should be scoured in New Zealand, but I do not advocate total prohibition. Three advantages would accrue—we would save the by-products, employ men for scouring, and save freight.

To the Chairman: We would like the Government to make an advance to us by way of loan for the erection of potash-works.

To Mr. Hornsby: In the event of Lever Bros. starting works at Petone, as was contemplated before the war, a large amount of our product would be usable by them for toilet preparations. I do not think Lever Bros. would take the business out of our hands.

WILLIAM GARDINER, Farmer, examined.

I have been asked to attend to speak about the wheat-growing industry. I have been a fairly large grower of wheat for the past thirty years, and along with other farmers I consider that we are not getting fair treatment from the Government. The price promised by the Government this year is 6s. 6d. f.o.b. The Australian wheat costs 6s. 10d. to land in New Zealand. As farmers we consider that we are entitled to the same price, whether it is this year or any other year, that the Australian people can get for their wheat—that is, the landed price here. The 6s. 10d. is without duty. Three or four years ago the Australian Government was buying wheat from the Argentine at 8s. 9d., and there is no reason why this should not happen again. If there is a drought in Australia there will be a shortage, and under those circumstances it would be most difficult for us to get wheat from Australia. At any rate, my view is that we are not being treated fairly. We farmers are growing wheat at a loss. I would have been much better off to-day if I had not grown a bag of wheat for the last twenty-five years, and I am voicing the opinion of almost every farmer in North Otago.

To the Chairman: I am not going to grow more wheat unless something is done. 6s. 6d. is the f.o.b. price. We pay for our sacks, but we lose 2d. or 3d. The Australian price of 6s. 10d. is sacks included. 6s. 6d. is a fixed price for all grades of milling-wheat, but I do not think it is so far gazetted. I wish I could make all my wheat into fowl-wheat: I could get more for it. There is no price fixed for fowl-wheat. In Southland it is selling at present at 8s. 6d. per bushel.

To Mr. Hornsby: The farmers were growing wheat at a loss last year. The crops are better this year than last, if we get them in, but year in and year out the farmers are losing money at wheat-growing. We have had seven or eight years bad, and the cost of production is very high. We were to have an open market. That was the promise of the Government, but it did not work, because we did not get it.

To Mr. Luke: Australian wheat is not to be compared with New Zealand wheat. There is no need to import Australian wheat, either for bakery or domestic purposes. It ought to be a legislative regulation that sufficient wheat should be grown in New Zealand to meet New Zealand's requirements. There are some farmers in this district who have not grown wheat for