

1840. I am now referring to the cast-iron spouting which was to have been 6in. ?—It is more than that, it is 6in. by 5in.

1841. That is what you have got ?—The spouting was made according to the detailed drawing. Part was made in Melbourne, and afterwards I found I could get it cast in Dunedin, and got them made by Shacklock.

1842. With the overflowing of these it was not necessary that the water should get into the building?—Certainly not. I was thinking of the internal gutters. Still, I think if it had done so I should have heard of it, but I never heard or saw anything about it.

1843. *Mr. Mountfort.*] I suppose you worked to this specification?—Yes.

1844. Then, about this boulder-packing business: Where do you find in the specification that you were to use boulder packing in the concrete?—Stone packing, sir.

1845. Well, stone packing. Where do you find that in the specification?—I have not seen the specification for a very long while.

*Mr. Blair:* I think, sir, you will find it is in the last line of the first paragraph of the specification.

1846. *Mr. Mountfort.*] I see now that stone packing may be used?—Yes; the stones have been described as boulders. I will explain how that is.

1847. Do you call them packing?—The word boulder is accounted for in this way: All the stones at Seacliff are boulders. For instance, I broke out a boulder that was 7ft. across, and it cut out 4 cubic yards. It is really spalled stone, and a splendid stone it was for building.

1848. How came the Commissioners to find on excavating a part of the foundation a boulder that was half in the concrete and half out of it?—I should say that that was an accident. It had no business there, and was never intended to be there.

1849. But one-half of it was in the earth. How do you account for that?—I cannot account for it. It certainly should not have been put in that way.

1850. Then the trench at that part could not have been cut out square?—In that case, no.

1851. Another point, please. You say that in the centre of the building it was to have been concrete up to the window-sill, or thereabouts?—It is clearly shown here [on plan].

1952. And for that you substituted brickwork in order to please Mr. Brindley?—Yes. In fact, so far as my impression goes, the whole bases were put in brick and cement.

1853. I want to ask you a question about this particular base on which you gave evidence before. You say it cost considerably more to put in brickwork and cement. Now, your concrete was £2 10s. per yard?—Yes.

1854. Did you ever run that price out at per foot?—That is not the view I am taking of it.

1855. Please answer my question. What is the cost per foot if the price is £2 10s. per cubic yard?—About 1s. 10d.

1856. I have worked it out. It is 1s. 10d. and a little more?—Yes.

1857. It is cemented brickwork. I was under the impression that it was mortar cement brickwork. At £31 per rod that will be 2s. and a fraction per foot, will it not?—Yes.

1858. So that the actual difference in the cost will be 2d. per foot?—Yes; but allow me to explain. That is as far as the schedule-prices are concerned; but bear in mind that the brickwork actually cost considerably more than stone. The alteration did not affect my price at all. If you take the actual cost of brick and cement, and then concrete, you will find that the putting in of brick and cement was, in fact, a considerable loss to me; for this reason: The stone was on the ground, it was broken by machinery, and could be put in in large quantities. On the other hand, the bricks had to be made on the ground at considerable expense—for that I will give you my reasons presently—or had to be brought from Dunedin, also at considerable expense. So that the concrete would have given me a considerably higher price than the brickwork would have done.

1859. *The Chairman.*] Mr. Gore means that there was more profit in the concrete than in the brickwork?—Exactly. Price had nothing to do with it, because it is in bulk. I wish to give this reason for saying that the bricks were made on the ground at very considerable expense. During the whole course of construction my desire was to give the best brick that could possibly be made. In the first place, I began with a wire machine, but the clay was unsuitable, and the machine did not press it hard enough. I then went to the expense of importing one of Carver's patents, costing upwards of £500, to put it in position on the work. My son has stated that this machine gave a pressure equal to 10 tons per brick, but I know more about the machine than he does, and I am prepared to say that its pressure was 30 tons per brick; consequently we gave a more solid brick and a better article. You will thus see that I did all in my power to get as good an article as it was possible to make. Of course, this is an expensive machine, and added materially to the cost of the bricks.

1860. Another question I have to ask is about the gable at the north end. You say that it was intended to be of a temporary character, and to have it taken down some day?—Yes; I always understood so. This [indicating on plan] is to be taken away too, because it forms a continuation of the corridor, as the case may be. For instance, if the building is continued here [indicating on plan], this wall will be done away with.

1861. The north wing is continued westward. If that is so, as we will suppose, you will have a room to be done away with and a staircase to be done away with. You cannot take out that northern wall there without leaving that room and that staircase all exposed?—My own impression was that that room was to be done away with, but I do not know whether the stair was to be.

1862. You think that all the way down from the top to the bottom of this western wall was to have been taken away at some time or other?—Evidently.

1863. And therefore it was not bonded in?—Evidently Mr. Brindley thought so, or he would not have ordered it to be done. It was done by the order of the Clerk of Works.