

2495. Reference has been made to two cracks appearing before the brickwork was erected on the concrete. Did you ascertain whether the foundations had moved at all?—I did not.

2496. You are not sure whether the foundations had shifted before the superstructure was gone on with?—I am not certain of it. I had no means of checking it.

2497. It is possible, is it not, that the basement concrete foundation may have slipped without your having noticed it?—It may.

2498. And the superstructure may have been built without your noticing any slip at all?—The only check done was this: Mr. Marchbank and Mr. Cameron gave me a line of the front of blocks to work to, and the measurements of the plans worked in right, there being nothing to take or give; in other words, the added dimensions of the building checked in with the line given and the concrete-wall.

2499. You are now referring to the new building after the foundations were in?—I mean that this wall [indicating on plan] was in: that the whole of the concrete-walls were built.

2500. Was it not possible that these two cracks may have been caused by the slipping down of this foundation towards the sea?—There was nothing of that sort. With regard to the cause, I do not know.

2501. You did not check your lines?—I had no means of doing so other than by going back.

2502. *Mr. Lawson.*] But before that you had begun to build?—Yes. If the line given to us was right and these dimensions came in, it would show that this wall had not moved.

2503. *Mr. Skinner.*] That is, of course, assuming that you carried out the dimensions which correspond with the other side?—Yes; if they correspond with the other side.

2504. There was a question asked you about raking out joints. There is something shown in the specifications about raking out. Who gave you orders that they should not be raked out?—Speaking from memory, it was simply allowed to go by.

2505. By doing that you did not get a key for the cement?—The brickwork was very rough. Another thing in regard to the specifications that I may mention is that washed sand was specified to be used right through, but none whatever was used.

2506. In the specification it refers to a bond of hoop iron. Was that carried out?—Not according to the specification; and the reason of that was owing to the immense number of flues it could not be put in. It would not have been any good. Instead of putting them every 3ft.—one course to each brick—we arranged them underneath the sills in solid work and over the lintels under the cement arches. The bond was put in double—two strips to each half brick. Mr. Gore consented to the alteration.

2507. Every course was lapped and tied or connected in a proper manner?—Yes; in the majority of cases. I am perfectly satisfied about that.

2508. What class of bond was used in the building?—I think that the specification shows five stretchers to header. In the majority of cases the brick was carried 3 and 1—three courses of stretcher and one of header. There was no English bond used except a little in the centre block.

2509. Here is a rough sketch of the brickwork at the north end of the ambulatory; it was taken by the Commissioners. [Sketch handed to witness.] Do you consider that a good bond?—I can partly explain that. There was an error there. That wall was started and carried up 9in., if I remember rightly.

2510. I mean at the extreme north end of the ambulatory?—That is how the bond came in.

2511. You have got no bond at all in the centre wall?—That is how the major portion of the wall was built.

2512. At any rate this portion that you are referring to now is a special place?—Yes, I think so. It is only a sample of the work of the men who were employed there.

2513. Do you consider that the works generally are of a first-class character, I mean according to the class of building you had to deal with?—I do not think that they were first-class; far from it.

2514. In that case the works were not finished to your satisfaction?—I would not say that *in toto*, but in certain cases they were not.

2515. Then you say that they were not finished to your satisfaction in certain cases?—Yes; I can give you several instances, if you like. They were carried out, as nearly as I could get, to the specification.

2516. At whose instigation was the downpipes ranged round the building, more especially for the eaves and gutters?—You mean with regard to the heads.

2517. The downpipes to the drains?—There was a question about these things, I think; about the size. I think there is a letter of mine on the subject.

2518. They were not put in according to specification, were they?—I cannot say from memory. What is the specified size?

2519. Five by four square. They do not carry off little more than half the contents?—They would carry more than that. I think they are a 5in. by 3in. D-shaped downpipe. It was sanctioned by Mr. Lawson that they should be altered. Where the question arose, first of all, was that the pipes which were sent up there were very flat; half-round you might call them. Those were the ones that I objected to. I think you will find some letters written by me in reference to them.

2520. On examination the Commissioners found that there was about 125ft. of spouting in the north wing—the front yard we may call it—and there is a 3in. pipe conveying the water from the eaves into the hopper-head, that representing something like 27 square feet of roofing to be carried away by this 3in. pipe. Do you think that it is enough?—I measured the swan-neck of the downpipes, which are made oval-shape, cut in the cast-iron gutter, with a lead-shoot let into it. They are mostly 5in. by 2½in. cut in the bottom of gutter, but I am not certain.

2521. Do you think that there are enough downpipes for the whole building to carry the water off?—I must at the time have thought there were, because there was no question about the number of them.