

foundation-trenches without boxes?—Yes: “The whole to be carefully mixed together, and when placed in position.”

1038. That is no reply at all. You may place it at the top of a building?—Then you would require to box it.

1039. Then the footing of the foundation is not put in position?—That is a different question.

1040. The specification distinctly states that when the concrete is placed in position it is to be boxed?—I see what you are driving at now. It does not say the trenches have got to be boxed.

1041. Does it say the trenches are not to be boxed?—It does not say so: it says, “The whole, when mixed, to be placed in position.” If you place concrete in position in a trench, you do not require to box it, but if you put concrete above that, you have to box all that is over the ground.

1042. I simply repeat the question: Is there anything in the specification to lead you to infer that no boxing was to be put in the trenches?—No: it says it is to be boxed in position.

1043. It is to be boxed in position in the trenches?—It does not say “trenches” there.

1044. *Mr. Blair.*] Do you say it is not to be boxed in trenches from that specification?—I assume it requires no boxing in the trenches.

1045. Tell us, then, upon what this assumption is grounded?—The assumption is grounded on all works. I have never seen occasion to put boxes in trenches. The trenches are cut out the size of the foundation, and the concrete is boxed by the trenches.

1046. From this specification do I understand it was not intended to put cases in the trenches?—I should never expect it.

1047. You are clear upon that point?—I never had it unless the material I was going through was of such a nature—

1048. I am not asking what you would not do, but how you read the specifications as a professional man?—As a professional man, I would not expect the contractor to go and box the foundation.

1049. Not from that specification?—No.

1050. Then how was he to get in his footings without boxing? Take these footings, for instance, where there are two steps?—You would require to box in there.

1051. Then, as these footings are shown on all the foundations from end to end, you would infer that he had to put boxing in the trenches?—Wherever the trenches were to receive a footing, when the footing decreases in the height of the foundation, then it would require to be boxed in.

1052. Then the plan simply shows that boxing was necessary?—According to that.

1053. *The Chairman.*] According to the contract-plan?—Yes.

1054. *Mr. Blair.*] And if you were tendering for that work as a contractor you would provide for boxing, would you not?—I would require to do so.

1055. You said something about the quality of the concrete—not very much. Did I understand from you—my notes are not very clear—that you saw the foundation bared at the bay-window at the northern front gate?—Yes.

1056. Your impression was that the concrete was put in 3ft. by 3ft. at this bay-window?—No: I said —

1057. That the concrete was all right?—The quality of the concrete correct.

1058. Can you speak as to the dimensions of it?—I have the dimensions here. The front wall and bay-window (north), 3ft. by 2ft. 6in.; 3ft. being the depth of it.

1059. From your recollection of that do you think the concrete was put in in a proper way?—I could see nothing wrong.

1060. This is a section taken of this place.

*Mr. Gore:* The “one-sided” section.

1061. *Mr. Blair.*] The one-sided section. It is a section of the front part of it, in which it shows the brickwork overhangs?—I did not see the brickwork on it. I have never been up to Seacliff since. I have never seen any of the brickwork in connection with this north wing at all. There was nothing but the concrete foundation in when I left.

1062. You said you saw no scamping at all?—No.

1063. And you were asked whether your attention had been directed to faulty work?—No; I cannot say my attention was directed to faulty work: in fact, I had very little conversation all the time I was up there.

1064. Is it likely your attention would be directed to faulty work if you were there as the representative of the contractor?—I did not look. I did not go up for that purpose.

1065. You said, with reference to these same plans, that, if these plans were produced to you to take the quantities off, that you would assume they were given to you to lead you astray?—I could not take it.

1066. But, supposing these plans were simply brought to you as evidence of the front part of the foundation of the building, would you consider they were sufficient?

*Mr. Gore:* I submit we have no evidence of that at all, but quite the reverse. I think the calculation of the foundations made on it.

*The Chairman:* Mr. Blair simply puts a question which, I think, is fair enough. As far as those sections show, he asks for his opinion.

*Mr. Gore:* I say the plan is false on the face of it.

*The Chairman:* That plan only indicates in hard lines what has actually been measured, I understand?

*Mr. Blair:* Yes.

*Mr. Gore:* Mr. Blair has brought evidence to show what the bearing-strain of this concrete is.

*The Chairman:* That is not in question now.

*Mr. Gore:* He says that is a perfect plan, because he brought Mr. Hay forward, who never measured the foundations, and he is brought to swear that the foundation, as shown on the plan,