

see if the cement would vulcanise with their outer stock. At p. 27 he admits that two things are necessary, the vulcanisation to the outer rubber and the cohesion to the shaft. Elsewhere (p. 32) he says he distinguishes very much between vulcanisation and cohesion. It would seem as if he either paid no attention to the question of cohesion with the iron, or else was so well satisfied on that point that he did not ask the defendants to test it. At p. 25 he says it is not customary, before wringers go out, to subject them to a test as to pressure, only as to vulcanisation. At p. 24, when asked, "What is the degree of pressure that you would regard as reasonable?" he answered: "A washerwoman's hands. That is all that should be reasonably expected." At p. 31 he says he does not remember having ever expressed an opinion that this mixture (the cement) would or would not cement to iron. "Q. And you do not undertake now to say whether it would or would not cement to iron? A. I would not undertake to say one way or the other." He admits knowledge that the cement was required for wringer-rollers, and that cohesion to the shaft was a necessity. Again he is asked on cross-examination: "Q. The whole substance of your evidence is that you got a sample, you mixed up a substance which was, as nearly as you could make it, the same as that sample? A. Yes, sir. Q. You did that quite irrespective of whether or not it would be suitable for the purpose of wringers? A. Certainly. Q. And you conceived it was none of your business whether it answered the purposes of wringer-rollers or not? A. Yes. Q. And that is your position? A. Yes."

His evidence as to the roller which he subsequently had made on one of the defendants' iron rods to prove the sufficiency of the cement, goes to shew that he then had vulcanisation in mind rather than cohesion. His letter of 20th January only speaks of having completed vulcanising. At p. 32 he is asked: "Q. You consider that you had very satisfactorily demonstrated that the cement stock manufactured by you would do its work? A. Would vulcanise. Q. You distinguish between vulcanising and cohesion? A. Yes, very much." At p. 33: "Q. You did not test it as to cohesion with the shaft? A. No. Q. You carefully avoided that? A. It was not the point with me, and it never occurred to me."