

the above Acts or in the *Gazette* notice, nor has the information submitted any definition of the term to the Court. The evidence against the defendant amounts at most to a matter of opinion arrived at by witnesses after a cursory inspection of the articles exposed for sale in defendant's shop-window.

According to Webster's International Dictionary, a "jewel" is, firstly, an ornament of dress usually made of a precious metal, and having enamel or precious stones as a part of its design; secondly, it is a precious stone or a gem: and a jeweller is one who makes or deals in jewels, precious stones, and similar ornaments. Defendant denies that he carries on the trade of a jeweller, and the City Council's Inspector, states that, after a careful inspection of defendant's goods, he found that they consisted chiefly of cheap trinkets and ornaments, and that the articles of greatest value the defendant had for sale were not worth more than 15s. If that is so, it is reasonable to assume that the greater part of defendant's goods are of the cheap variety, and judging by those on view in the shop-window, which are said to be his best, I think the Inspector's opinion is correct. To constitute defendant a jeweller within the definition just referred to, I think he would require to stock a considerably better class of goods than those on view in his window. As to the signature on the requisition, it was placed there without his authority, and I attach no importance to it. On the whole, I am not prepared to hold that defendant is a jeweller, and I therefore think he is not affected by the *Gazette* notice dealing with such persons.

Information dismissed.

AUGUST, 1907.

Nelson.—(Factories Act): At the Magistrate's Court, on the 19th August, a draper was charged on the information of the Inspector of Factories with having, on the 29th July, exposed for sale a shirt on which there was no label indicating that it had been made elsewhere than in a registered factory.

The defendant pleaded guilty.

The information was laid under subsection (3) of section 28 of "The Factories Act, 1901," which makes provision "for the better suppression of what is commonly known as the 'sweating evil.'"

Defendant pleaded ignorance of the law. He could assure the Court that there would be no repetition of the offence. As soon as he knew that he was doing wrong the article forming the subject of the prosecution was withdrawn.

The Inspector said his instructions were to press for a penalty, but not a heavy penalty. The defendant let out work, and the woman who did the work got 7½d. a shirt, and had to find buttons and cotton. For ladies' chemises the woman got 6d. each, and the same price was paid for knickers. The public should know what was being paid for the goods.

The defendant, in a statement, said the price paid in Dunedin was the same as he was paying now. He mentioned one large wholesale firm that paid 7s. 6d. a dozen for shirts, and he said that last week he had had an offer from Wellington for shirts at 8s. a dozen for men's and 6s. for boys'. He did not know the law, and he had spoken to the representatives of the large firms, and they also were ignorant of the provisions under notice. The defendant stated that nearly the whole of the underclothing he had sold was made on his own premises, the woman referred to having made only about a dozen of the articles. At the price paid for chemises and knickers a woman could make 1s. an hour, and for nightdresses she could make more than that. He did not know how many shirts a woman could make in a day. The worker had to do the cutting. He had let her have a machine worth £7 10s. for £3, and something had been paid off the cost of the machine.

The Inspector of Factories stated that he had been told that one woman, working long hours, earned 13s. a week. What the defendant had said in reference to prices paid elsewhere by large firms was correct, but in these cases the work was cut out by machinery, and the workers were given different parts, and by this method the articles could be made much more cheaply. Other houses paid 9s. a dozen, and for special orders 1s. each.

The defendant said that what the Inspector said was correct, but it might be that the work was done by apprentices receiving low wages.

The shirt forming the subject of the prosecution was exhibited in Court, and was marked at 2s. 6d.

The Magistrate feared from what was seen that it was the thin edge of the wedge. Sweating must be prevented. This was the first case to come before him, but any other cases would be more severely dealt with. The defendant was fined £1, and costs £1 11s.

SEPTEMBER, 1907.

Auckland.—(Factories Act): A milliner was fined 5s., with costs 7s., in each of the following cases: (1) Failing to pay wages to an apprentice; (2) accepting a premium from an apprentice: nominal fines were inflicted, as the wages had been paid and the premium refunded.

Wanganui.—(Factories Act): A drapery firm pleaded guilty at the Magistrate's Court on the 4th September, 1907, to offering for sale certain pillow-slips which were not labelled to show that they had been made outside a registered factory. The charge was a breach of section 28 of the Factories Act.

The defendants explained that the person who made the goods was in very poor circumstances, and had been given the work to help her along. The manager of the firm was under the impression when he gave the work that the woman's place was registered, as she did work for other persons, and they were, therefore, suffering for her default in not registering. The firm had complied with the Act in so far as the keeping of the woman's name, address, price to be paid for the work, description of work, &c., were concerned, and the offence, they held, was a technical one, being also the first of the kind in Wanganui.