

—that is 2½ in difference by compression. Would it be possible, do you think, to so compress a wall without it showing signs of great distress?—It would show somewhere; but you might compress a building to a great extent without it showing signs of distress.

1970. Did you ever hear of such a thing?—Never. But if it slipped down bodily like this one did there would be a cause for it.

1971. Suppose that this building had moved this much downhill, and had turned upon this point—say the division between 10 and 11 in Block 2. If it had moved down here such a large distance, would there not show a break here [indicating on plan]?—It ought to do. If it sprung round there some part of this wall ought to show it.

1972. Can you form an idea as to what width the crack should be there?—I do not profess to give an opinion of that at all.

1973. Would it be about 5 in.?—It might be 6 in.

1974. Between 10 and 11 there is a hinge or sheer, because we have it in evidence that there is no symptom of cracks south of that line. Supposing that the whole thing were moving uphill, would not the sheer be across?—Inevitably.

1975. Or the sheer across the wall would show it if it is moving?—Yes. But brickwork is very tenacious, and a broad wall will bear a great deal without showing.

1976. If it were moving towards the south the whole point is on the hinge; if it is moving eastward, parallel to the building, towards where the sheer occurs?—If this part stood without moving there would be a crack.

1977. The two would come past each other?—That does not follow.

1978. But if it moves as on a hinge the effect would be something like this [indicating on plan]?—If it moves bodily as you describe the effect would be for the wall to open.

1979. What would be the size of the opening?—That I cannot tell you.

1980. If it moves in that direction, you suggest a north-east movement?—I do not say that the building did move north-east. I have told you already that I have not seen the building for four years.

A plan [document No. 18] showing the present position of the building was here handed it.

---

TUESDAY, 21ST FEBRUARY, 1888.

*Mr. Lawson*: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I may state that having found myself somewhat at a loss as to forms of procedure in matters of this kind—this is totally a new experience to me, I may say—and I feel myself to a great extent at a disadvantage, as Mr. Blair, who is conducting the inquiry on the other side, is accustomed to this sort of thing. I feel it necessary to myself to employ a solicitor, and he is here present now.

*Mr. F. R. Chapman*: I was just going to say that I have simply to apply in the first instance on Mr. Lawson's behalf, for leave to attend the inquiry as his counsel.

*Mr. Blair*: I beg to read the correspondence that has taken place between Mr. Lawson and myself on this subject. On Saturday I got the following letter: "As I am informed that you have been employing a solicitor to assist you at the Seacliff inquiry, I now write to inform you that I intend to do so also, and that he will be present during the remainder of the inquiry.—R. A. LAWSON." I replied to that on Monday morning: "Replying to yours to hand of the 18th instant, you have been misinformed as to my employing a solicitor to assist me. I have not employed a solicitor, nor have I received legal assistance or advice in any shape or form." This reply was sent to Mr. Lawson. The grounds on which he stated that he was going to employ a solicitor have no existence, because I am not employing a solicitor, nor have I taken any legal advice or assistance whatever. He has now departed from the grounds he first stated, and says he now wishes for professional assistance—on account of my superior legal training, I suppose. He wishes to have Mr. Chapman. I strongly object to Mr. Chapman or any other solicitor appearing. Before the inquiry began I pointedly asked Mr. Lawson and Mr. Gore if they were going to appear by counsel, and they both said "No." Then I said I will not appear by counsel. The inquiry has gone on so far that my view of the matter is about two-thirds finished. I have nearly done, and it would be unfair to me, I submit, that counsel should now appear. I cannot pretend to cope with a lawyer like Mr. Chapman, or with any other lawyer that Mr. Lawson might bring here. I will not undertake to cope with him. If he has a lawyer, I must have one too; and if I have a lawyer on my side, we must begin again *de novo*. Mr. Lawson's case has not begun, so that any lawyer can take it up, but my case is two-thirds through, so that no lawyer could take it up, and both myself and my lawyer would be at a disadvantage.

*Mr. Chapman*: I submit there is really nothing in Mr. Blair's objection.

*Mr. Blair*: Is Mr. Chapman appearing now?

*Mr. Chapman*: The fact of the matter is, that in these inquiries it has been usual—certainly in those conducted in Dunedin—in every case almost that I have known of here counsel have appeared. In the late Seacliff inquiry I applied to the Commissioners, and they at once granted permission, stating at the same time that they considered the matter one within their own discretion, which I admitted at once. In former inquiries—the high school, for instance—I was admitted, and in the recent school inquiry counsel were admitted, and so at the great gaol inquiry some years ago; in fact, counsel were admitted in almost every inquiry. The only different circumstance here is that the inquiry has commenced. Now the circumstance that Mr. Lawson asks leave to have the inquiry continued with counsel at a late stage is certainly not to Mr. Blair's disadvantage, far from it Mr. Lawson may have put himself at considerable disadvantage through not making the application at the outset; but that cannot tell to Mr. Blair's disadvantage. I confess I should find myself under considerable disadvantage in working into the matter now, because I know nothing of the evidence that has already gone, and I should not ask the Commissioners for any delay or concessions. I