

will not carry the bearing-weight, and Mr. Forrest said he could not possibly arrive at any conclusion from that plan.

1067. *Mr. Blair.*] I am merely asking you if that plan would show you the state of the front part of the concrete?—That plan shows that.

1068. Does it purport to show that?—Yes, it purports to show that; but of course you could make no calculation from that as to the quantity of concrete in the foundation.

1069. Here is a section which shows the wall with the concrete flush with the front wall—section No. 9A; there is another section, 17B; another section, 18; another section, 10: if you found that the brickwork was simply built flush with the concrete, and you only saw the front wall, would you assume that the balance of the concrete was left as a large footing inside?—I could not say that: it is quite possible.

1070. Suppose that you could not get inside without tearing up the floors and spoiling the building, and you found the brickwork overhanging or flush with the concrete on the outside, would you assume that the balance of 3ft. was on the inside of the wall?—Well, I could not say anything as to that unless you got behind the wall.

1071. In measuring this concrete did you deduct anything for faulty work?—There were deductions.

1072. For faulty work?—I could not say for faulty work: there were deductions.

1073. Did not you hear of deductions being made for faulty work?—Not to my knowledge.

1074. Nothing about one fifty yards being put in in defiance of the Inspector?—I do not know.

1075. Now, coming to the question of these cracks, can you really, as a professional man, profess to give any opinion as to what the settlement is due to, or what is the nature of the settlement, without a close inspection of the building?—I only gave my opinion of what I saw on the plans. I would not give an opinion without seeing the building.

1076. Would you like, as a professional man of some little standing, to give a deliberate opinion as to the cause of this damage on the facts placed before you by Mr. Lawson and Mr. Gore?—No.

1077. Then we are to assume that this opinion of yours is very provisional indeed?—Just what I consider the result would be of the sinkage.

1078. In dealing with this question of the slip, I gathered from you that you were assuming that the pressure came upon this north-west corner?—Yes.

1079. If you were told or assured that there was no evidence of any undue pressure, settlement, or movement of any kind at that corner, would that affect your opinion?—There seems to have something moved.

1080. But if you were told that there is no evidence whatever, or very little evidence, of movement at the north-west gable, but ample evidence of it along the ambulatory, would you still assume that the pressure had come from that corner?—It could act from no other part to bring the building forward 16in.

1081. Then, are you satisfied it is possible that the building came forward 16in.?—Satisfied if the hill moves.

1082. Without seeing any cracks of magnitude anywhere except here in the south end of the north ambulatory?—It would show cracks all over.

1083. If you were told there were no cracks worth mentioning from, at any rate, the first stack of chimneys, would you still assume that the building had moved 16in.?—Yes.

1084. You would?—Yes. I know a building in Dunedin that has gone down bodily 3in., and it does not show a crack from one end to the other.

1085. You were asked to give an opinion on the question as to how to account for the back slipping or moving 3in. more than the south front, and your answer was that it was possible for this to be taken up by the building—crushed into the building?—Yes.

1086. Would your opinion, then, of that be modified if you were told there were no cracks at that place?—Then I would assume that it had gone in the opening at the north portion of the ambulatory.

1087. Would you assume that the two walls of the ambulatory were compressed?—Yes, to the extent of 3in.

1088. If we find the ambulatory at its full width there, and that it is actually compressed in the middle, would that affect your conclusion?—Well, I could not account for it—or, I may modify that, and say it is quite possible this building may have been 3in. less in measurement.

1089. Now, you first assume and say it is possible for the building to slip forward, as on a huge sledge, like the launching of the “Great Eastern”—to slip forward 16in.—and then you assume that the front part of the building slipped forward 13in.?—I cannot account for that 3in. at all.

1090. Then you withdraw what you stated with reference to it?—No. I endeavoured to explain the reason; but if the walls are rigid and show the same measurement—

1091. Very well; I will take it another way. You say it is possible for the front of the building to have gone forward 13in.?—Yes.

1092. Then, you were told that the front part went 13in. and the back part 16in. We must assume, then, that the whole building went forward first the 13in. Is not that so?—Yes.

1093. Then, in order to bring this compression theory into operation, we must assume the front part of the building has settled, stopped?—Remained stationary.

1094. Then the back part of the building came down 3in. further and squeezed it up?—Yes.

1095. And the front part of the building, after moving—well, by some process unknown to physics, had got anchored down to the rock below?—I do not know that. I was asked what I would consider the cause of the difference between the 16in. and the 13in., and the only cause I could see would be the compression.

1096. Now, supposing you went out there, and found one block of the building 16in. downhill