

crete, and ascertained that the wall would only carry one-half of what is shown on the general plan, would you believe me?—No, because you cannot do it. I cannot do it myself, at all events.

2656. In fact, it is impossible to take measurements off that plan?—So far as thickness and depth are concerned.

2657. You say that you cannot get the cubical contents from it?—You cannot.

2658. You have always contended that that back wall went down?—Yes.

2659. So that that wall has been measured and paid for as an extra; yet Mr. Blair says that it was not?—According to Mr. Lawson's instructions it was measured up as an extra.

2660. Here are your quantities [hands the document to witness]. Can you find in any part of these quantities where it is charged as an extra?—These are not my quantities, they are Mr. Forrest's.

2661. But they are initialed and signed by you. You will find the wall there?—The quantities were examined by me, as I said already. With regard to this wall, I maintain that it was measured as an extra by me along with Mr. Forrest, who insisted that the cross walls should be stepped up the bank and back wall taken as about 2ft. 6in. deep.

2662. But what I am asking you is this: Was that wall paid for as an extra? Did the Contractor receive payment for it as an extra?—I maintain that he did.

2663. Can you show me in your quantities where it was so paid for?—Not at the present time I cannot. It is some four years ago now.

2664. But it is a permanent thing, so that you can hardly forget it?—The reason why I put "examined" was because I would not say that the quantities were correct. That would have been committing myself to what I had objected to all through.

2665. Then, it only shows that you were satisfied that the figures were correct?—Yes.

2666. And that you were not satisfied with the principal measurements?—If I had been I should have said, "Examined and found correct." Mr. Forrest wanted me to do that, but I would not. While I was perfectly satisfied at the time that they were accurate I would not say more than that.

2667. Will you please give a reply to my question afterwards if you cannot do so now. My desire is to have a reply for a very important reason connected with this inquiry?—It is nearly six years ago, which is too long a time to ask me to recollect figures.

2668. You said that you were not sure that the foundations of the north ambulatory-wall—the back wall of the north ambulatory, I should say—shifted before the brickwork began?—We had no means of checking it.

2669. In noticing the crack, did it appear to be larger at the top than at the bottom, or was there any difference?—I could not see a very material difference.

2670. It was not a very large crack?—No. When I reported it it was $\frac{3}{4}$ in to $\frac{1}{2}$ in.

2671. You said that you were not satisfied with the concrete all through. Was not your dissatisfaction, in reality, to stone-packing being put in in any shape or form?—Yes; I do object to stone-packing, but I also objected to the manner in which it was put in just there.

2672. Did you not object to stone-packing being put in in the concrete all through?—That is making out that I am biassed. If in anything I had to do with myself I should object to stone-packing being put in.

2673. At any distance apart?—Yes, especially in 2in. metal.

2674. Now the question has been brought up about penalties: do you know how long it was after the first contract was signed before the Contractor could get possession of the back portion of the centre block?—That was a matter purely your own. You undertook the excavation, but you wanted the clay for your brickmaking, and therefore did not excavate.

2675. For the back of the centre block?—Yes. You used it all through at the back of the centre and south blocks.

2676. Can you tell me how long it was before the Contractor got possession of the site at the back of the centre block—can you tell me approximately? Would it be two or three years, or how long?—You had the whole of the site after the patients knocked off excavating.

2677. I will put it to you in another way: how long was it before the back portion centre block was commenced?—That I cannot tell you.

2678. Well, I am not particular to a month or two; was it two years?—It was a very long time after the front portion was done.

2679. Will you be surprised if I tell you that it was two years?—I should not, knowing the way that the work was going on.

2680. The site of the building was moved, was it not?—Yes.

2681. Which necessitated the moving of all the machinery and of the shed covering it?—Yes.

2682. Do you know if the water supply was ever stopped? Was the water cut off by Dr. Neill? But before you answer these questions I will read to you a letter which I wrote. "28th February, 1882. R. A. Lawson, Esq.—Dear Sir,—I was at Seaclyff yesterday, and found the work stopped for want of water. I wrote you on the 7th of last month that the water had been diverted from my dam to the temporary asylum. On inspecting the creek I found they had cut a trench right through and under the bed of the creek to a depth of about 6ft., effectually cutting off the only supply of water I have. The money I have spent in providing a water-supply is now wasted. Every week I have been increasing the number of men and had the work in full swing, and it is now a considerable loss to me, especially at this season of the year, to have the work stopped. I shall certainly expect the Government to hold me free from any loss.—Yours faithfully, JAMES GORE." Is there anything wrong in that letter?—I remember that letter and the circumstances of it. I think there is a letter of mine to Mr. Ussher, with a sketch showing what was done with that creek.

2683. Do you produce it?—I may say that they wanted some water for the temporary building, as it is called, and they sunk a hole in the creek, filled it up with stones, and put in a pipe; a little reservoir was formed about 16ft. square, and pipes taken from same to supply temporary build-