

do you think there would have been any subsidence at all?—There might have been a little; but I do not think there would have been the damage that now exists.

661. Do you think the original footings would have been strong enough?—The original footings, if they had been put in of good concrete, would have carried all the weight that would have come upon them.

662. On the present formation?—Yes.

663. Does the present floor-level of the north wing conform to the level of the bases—was it taken parallel with the horizontal portion of the bases?—The ambulatory-floor is not level. Along the ambulatories to the north door the concrete floor was not level along the two wings—not quite level.

664. Do they conform to each other—do they take the same shape—does the floor-line of the ambulatory take the same shape as the bases of the piers?—Oh! you mean——

665. Longitudinally?—No; there is a gradual grade in the floor-level of the ambulatory, and the south pillar is level with No. 7.

666. Have you taken a line along—that is, an axis-line along the centre of the ambulatory, from the south to the north end?—Yes.

667. Can you tell us what the result is?—The centre line. The result is shown on this plan. It shows that the north door is 16½ in. out of line downhill, and the front of the wing about 13 in. downhill.

668. Beyond the south wing?—Beyond the south wing.

669. Have you any reason to believe it was built in that way?—I have every reason to believe it was built in that way.

670. *The Chairman.*] How do you arrive at that conclusion?—Because there is a corresponding mistake in the intermediate wing.

*Mr. Gore* : This wing is 13½ in. towards the sea.

671. *Mr. Blair.*] And this one?—Is 11½ in. the other way.

672. *Mr. John Gore.*] Did you measure the plan to see which was correct?—Yes; the south one is correct.

673. *The Chairman.*] I suppose you have tried to come to some conclusion whether the building moved bodily down 1 ft. or 13 in. or not; and, if you think it has not, what are your reasons for thinking so?—If the building had moved in that way all through, the colonnade-wall would have been cracked at the north end, and the back wall would have been cracked to pieces at the south end.

674. *Mr. Blair.*] What would have been the depth of the crack at this place?—I should have looked for a crack of 2 in., and there is no indication whatever of such a movement in the ground. A movement of 1 ft. would never have escaped notice. Unless it had been a deep movement everything would have gone to smash.

675. *The Chairman.*] Supposing this portion of the ground, including the building, had slipped 1 ft. or 13 in., or whatever it may be, in any way, whether it had moved from the centre or gone bodily, you would have expected to find indications on the ground of where it had ceased. For instance, at the north end, here, of the building, there would have been a rupture in the ground somewhere?—There must have been.

676. *Mr. Blair.*] Suppose that the movement had commenced as far as the central block, or half-way to the central block—for there are no cracks south of that—and supposing that the remainder of this portion, from the middle of that recess to the end of the building, had moved down the 15 in. or 16 in. you find it to be down, what would be the size of the crack there?—Oh! some 3 in. or 4 in.

677. Is there any crack there?—There is a little crack in the basement, but it has been filled up long ago.

678. *Mr. Skinner.*] That crack would be there, assuming everything went down bodily?—Yes, or that it turned.

679. *Mr. Lawson.*] Is it not possible that the crack should be distributed?—If it had been you would have had cracks at the back and at the front. There are no cracks of that kind. There are 3 in. difference in the lengths. The one is 13 in. and the other 16 in. The front has only gone 13 in. and the back 16 in.

680. *Mr. Blair.*] So that it must have crept upon itself 3 in.?—Yes.

681. How much would it round out in the north wall: would that 3 in. be taken up?—The north wall is straight along the ground-level. It bulges above the ground-level, but at the ground-level the wall is straight, and practically parallel to the others.

682. Can you say that it is sliding like as if it was on a huge greased slide, like the launching of the "Great Eastern"?—I have heard such a thing proposed, but it is so ridiculous I should not like to mention it.

683. Talking of that discrepancy, do you think it possible for the middle wall to have slipped up 15 in.—the middle block?—Not at all likely.

684. Do you think the one is as likely as the other?—The one is just as likely as the other. There is no evidence whatever—no cracks in the ground to account for such movement—and it never would have escaped notice.

685. *Mr. Lawson.*] You say that the front-ambulatory wall there—the sinking of it—has caused all the mischief?—Yes.

686. Can you give us the proof of it?—I have given the proofs already. I have described that already.

687. Where is the evidence of its sinking?—I have shown you on my drawings.

688. No, you have never shown us anything. You say that the north-ambulatory floor is all but level?—No.

689. Well, what is the difference?—It is not level. The north-ambulatory floor is not level.