

self on setting out that building. If it had been 13½ in out there, it could not have been avoided being noticed.

1939. *Mr. Lawson.*] But Mr. Hay says it is 16½ in. out?—Then it must have been plainly seen.

1940. Suppose we now describe it at that very point as being down 16½ in., what should you say has caused it?—There can be only one cause.

1941. And what is that?—It has gone down hill.

1942. By main force?—By pressure at the back; by the ground and water—more especially the water—pressing in at the back.

1943. Supposing that you had also known that in the same block a similar distance had been sunk or had moved along laterally, what would you say then with regard to the whole block?—That it must have slipped bodily down.

1944. Now with regard to detailed drawings, do you know of your own knowledge who prepared those drawings?—The only drawing that I can swear to as having been prepared by one particular person was this 1½ in. scale-drawing, and that was prepared by Mr. Brindley; but as to who prepared the others, I cannot speak positively.

1945. As a matter of fact, he retained the detailed drawings in his own possession, and simply allowed you to obtain information concerning them?—He allowed me to see them whenever I wanted them; but, as a matter of fact, I did not want to see them, because Mr. Brindley had marked out the moulds for the mason.

1946. Did you ask him to do that?—No. I will say this of him: as a matter of fact, he was most attentive, and went to far more trouble than there was any occasion.

1947. As a matter of fact, then, you do not know whether the detailed drawings are prepared in my office or not?—I know that some were prepared in your own office. I rather think that we had some drawings of the turret from your office. These were projections carried in the tower.

1948. *The Chairman.*] Are there cracks in the tower?—No; and that they say is where my bad concrete is.

1949. *Mr. Lawson.*] Were you ever at any time detained for the want of detailed drawings; if so, why and for what time?—At this tower here, we were stopped for a considerable time for the want not so much of detailed drawings as of instructions as to how it was to be constructed.

1950. How long do you think you were detained?—I believe fully two or three months. That is the only case I can remember.

1951. When these drawings were finished, do you know whose they were?—I believe that they were yours. I believe also that you gave me instructions in your own office. There is no section showing the tower. We were pretty high up with the tower when you instructed me to put railway iron round the tower. I think it was a verbal order.

1952. That iron was put in?—Yes.

1953. Might not that be the reason of the stoppage?—It was the reason. I was prepared to go on. It was one of those times when Mr. Brindley got his back up. There was, moreover, an alteration in the tower. When it was carried up a certain height, a set-off was made; and after building it, Mr. Brindley had it pulled down some 2 ft. or 3 ft.

1954. And brought to the full thickness?—Yes.

1955. Nothing was charged for that?—Nothing.

1956. *Mr. Blair.*] You stopped first of all for three months for want of detailed drawings for the tower?—It might have been two or three months. I cannot say it was for want of the drawings. It was more for the want of instructions how to construct it.

1957. You also attribute delay for the want of iron rails?—No.

1958. Whose duty was it to inform you?—I have always applied to the Clerk of Works, and he has generally given me my instructions, except on special occasions, when Mr. Lawson has ordered things, when he was there; but as a general rule Mr. Brindley gave me instructions.

1959. You believe that the building was faithfully built to the line and the levels?—Yes, as nearly as that length of building would allow.

1960. If you found that the block was out of line downhill you would attribute it to the slipping?—I fancy so. If, as Mr. Lawson described it, in this length of building it is 13½ in. out of line, then this ground must have moved.

1961. Have you found any block that is as much as that uphill?—It is impossible to have the slip uphill.

1962. If you found it out of line uphill how would you account for it?—Allow me to understand your question. I know what you mean. If you mean that this wing is here [indicating on plan] one foot short, it was built that way.

1963. There has been no evidence of that?—But Mr. Brindley will give you evidence of that.

1964. You think that the building can only be out of line?—I admit it out of line.

1965. You can only account for it by assuming that the building has gone downhill?—That is what I assume; but it is only an opinion. I say that if it is out of line 16½ in. it must have gone downhill.

1966. Do you think that a building so many feet long, say, 140 ft., would slip endways; that if the hill went down the building would go with it? Do you think it is possible for a building to have gone down without showing serious symptoms of distress?—It is possible for a building to slip bodily without showing much symptoms of distress. If you ask me about the ground I tell you that I know that the ground did slip in a north-east direction.

1967. Then you would expect the building to slip in a north-east direction?—Yes.

1968. But if you do not find it slipping in that direction will you modify your opinion?—If the building is 16½ in. out of line, and it was not so when I saw it four years ago, there must be a reason for it; and the reason I give is that the ground is slipping.

1969. We have it in evidence that the building was out of line 13½ in. in front and 16 in. behind