

above the trenches was put in casing. I may be allowed to mention here that the "boxing" referred to in the specification of the foundations applied generally to the bases of the building. The base was originally intended to be of concrete, but Mr. Brindley ordered it to be built of brick. And one of the reasons he gave for ordering the substitution was, that we could not get plugs in it for fixing joiner's work. At all events, that was the reason he gave for substituting brickwork for concrete in the base.

1299. You say that concrete in the base was done away with, and brick and cement used instead?—Yes.

1300. At what distance apart did Mr. Brindley want the stone packing put in?—I have heard him mention several things; but 9in. to 1ft. apart seemed to be his idea of it. So long as it was placed 9in. apart he never said anything; he never made any remark. That seemed to be satisfactory to him.

1301. Do you remember the concrete being put in at the extreme south of the building?—Yes.

1302. Do you remember anything in connection with that?—Yes. What I recollect of that is this: Mr. Brindley condemned a portion of the concrete on account of the packing being too close. I may say here that it occurred entirely through Mr. Gore senior's own fault. The gangers were placing the packing exactly as I had instructed them; but Mr. Gore, sen., seemed to think that it was not close enough; in fact, he told them not to put it in more than 6in. apart.

1303. You were not there at the time that this front wall was concreted?—Yes, I was. Mr. Brindley objected to and afterwards condemned it, and it was taken out.

1304. What portion of the concrete was that? Do you remember which of these three walls it was?—From about that wall [indicating on plan] to the centre part of the south wing.

1305. Did this wall remain in for long?—It remained in for a couple of weeks.

1306. Not more than that?—I cannot say that it remained for more.

1307. Eventually it was allowed to remain in, was it not?—Some of it was allowed to remain in. We started to take it out; but it was such a hard, solid mass that Mr. Brindley stopped us from taking it out.

1308. The concrete was, in fact, good?—Yes.

1309. Do you remember if any of that concrete was kept there for months afterwards?—I believe it was—on the outside of the building.

1310. Open to inspection by any one?—Yes.

1311. When this concrete was taken out Mr. Brindley was satisfied?—He was quite satisfied, and some of it was left in.

1312. Have you heard him complain of any other portions of the concrete foundations?—I never have.

1313. You saw the building before any of the brickwork was commenced in the ambulatory of Block 2 (north)?—Yes.

1314. Do you remember any crack at the back of this concrete wall?—Distinctly.

1315. Was it at the rear of the wall?—The crack appeared before any bricks were laid on it. To the best of my recollection the crack was just behind where one of the south buttresses is erected at present.

1316. There was no weight of scaffolding, was there, to account for this crack?—None whatever.

1317. Can you give any opinion as to the cause of the crack?—Most decidedly I can.

1318. What is it?—In my opinion it is caused by a movement of the ground, and to the best of my belief it takes this direction: it goes through the northern end of the temporary asylum, down through the centre of the north ambulatory; it skirts the angle of Block 1 (north), and inclines southward in front of the central block; goes down a gully in front of the central block, and then to the Seacliff Railway-station.

1319. In your opinion, can this slip that you speak of be easily defined?—I mean, of course, at the time you were out there on the work?—Yes, at that time it could be. Of course there has been a large quantity of levelling in the front part of the building done since then, and that has greatly altered the appearance of the ground.

1320. Is there any indication that this slip has affected the railway-platform?—Yes; within my own knowledge it has affected it.

1321. To what extent?—Within my own knowledge it has moved the platform 2ft. 11in. to the seaward.

1322. That is, the railway-platform itself?—Yes.

1323. Can you speak also of the ground here [indicating on plan]? Was it high, low, or good ground?—The ground at the top of the tramway, at the extreme north-east angle of the building, about 30ft. or 40ft. from the north-east angle, dipped very suddenly.

1324. Do you remember what state that ground was naturally in—was the soil a good solid or a porous clay?—It was a porous kind of clay. When exposed to the sun it would crack or open out.

1325. Would water percolate through it?—It certainly would not hold water.

1326. You remember the reservoir that the Government built?—Most distinctly.

1327. What kind of clay was it that the reservoir was puddled with?—It seemed to be very similar to the clay-formation of the main building.

1328. Did this puddle hold water?—The reservoir would not hold water when it was finished.

1329. Did it cause them much trouble or expense?—It caused a considerable amount of expense. I should say that as much was spent in making it hold water as it originally cost to build, but I do not recollect what the amount was.

1330. From the fact that this reservoir would not hold water do you conclude that the clay was porous—that the water would percolate through it?—Most decidedly. I may tell you that I went up and examined it at one time when it was empty. There seemed to be a spring, for the water