

may have assumed certain things. I dare say he is a very good man at figures, but I say that he is not correct, according to that plan.

1363. This is a drawing [produced] showing the toothing?—Yes.

1364. Do you know what the object of that toothing was?—So far as I understood it, it was with the object of extending this block [indicating on plan] backwards to the top level on some future day.

1365. In carrying up this portion (the west gable of Block 2, north) to what thickness did you build?—It is built to the thickness shown in the drawing. Mr. Brindley gave me instructions to tooth it in here and there.

1366. You considered it a temporary gable?—Yes; it would have to come out at some future day.

1367. Is there any other portion of the building toothed in the same manner?—This angle (the extreme north of the same block, going north) is toothed also.

1368. Is any portion of the building toothed except where it is intended to make additions to it?—Oh, no!

1369. During the time that you were at Seaciff did you notice any settlement in the building? When I speak of settlement I allude, of course, to vertical settlement?—I cannot say that I did. The floors always seemed to be perfectly level, and that I take to be an indication of there being no vertical settlement. The floors would have been out of level if there had been vertical settlement.

1370. Did you notice any vertical settlement in this corridor?—There was no vertical settlement.

1371. Did you notice the condition of the superstructure above the first section of the floor?—I took notice that there was not even the sign of a crack in the wall above the piers.

1372. Did you notice any cracks through the window-sills?—Not in the front-ambulatory wall.

1373. If vertical settlement had occurred, would it not have shown in the window-sills in the first instance?—It was bound to have shown there, it being the weakest spot.

1374. And you say that there were no signs of vertical settlement and no cracks there?—Yes.

1375. No indications of cracks?—Not in the slightest.

1376. Are the windows plumb?—From some observations that I took roughly they seemed fairly plumb.

1377. You were at Seaciff when the piers were built. Do you think that it is possible that the variations in the levels spoken of by Mr. Hay have occurred—viz., $\frac{1}{2}$ in. in a line of 78 ft.?—Well, I should call it practically correct if it were built like that.

1378. You think, then, that it is possible that these piers have been built $\frac{1}{4}$ in. out of level?—Yes, I do.

1379. Taking that into consideration, piers 1 and 7 are a dead level, are they not?—Yes.

1380. How many feet are Nos. 1 and 7 piers apart?—About 42 ft.

1381. The intermediate piers between Nos. 1 and 7 are from $\frac{1}{8}$ in. to $\frac{1}{4}$ in. out of level?—So Mr. Hay says.

1382. Taking that for granted, do you think that that is anything surprising in a large building like that?—I should think, as I have already said, that it is practically correct.

1383. Supposing that this building had sunk—and it was not built that way— $\frac{1}{2}$ in. in 80 ft., would that have caused this wall to bulge over?—No.

1384. I will ask you the question in another form: If this wall has sunk $\frac{1}{2}$ in. in 80 ft. what width of crack would there be in a wall 38 ft. high?—Less than $\frac{1}{4}$ in.—certainly less than $\frac{1}{2}$ in. I have had a model made of it, and can practically illustrate it if the Commissioners like. It would be bound to crack here [indicating on plan] less than $\frac{1}{4}$ in.

1385. Is there any crack in the south end of the ambulatory?—No.

1386. Would there have been a crack there if there had been any settlement?—It was bound to have occurred.

1387. Is the pressure on this back wall—the back concrete retaining-wall, I think we may call it—enough to account for these piers being thrust out of the perpendicular?—I should imagine that it is. If the ground was slipping at any depth it would certainly have a tendency to carry the foundations bodily forward.

1388. Then it is your opinion that the cracks in the ambulatory of Block No. 2 (north) are not caused by vertical settlement?—They are certainly not so caused.

1389. And that the foundation has not settled down?—It has not. If the foundations had settled down we could have seen the cracks in the concrete. We had it exposed.

1390. Do you consider that the concrete foundations are equal to carry the superstructure above them?—They are, provided that the ground is good; but if there was forty times as much concrete it would not carry the superstructure if the ground were moving.

1391. *Mr. Lawson.*] At any one time during the course of building did you ever hear Mr. Brindley say that I interfered with his free action in regard to the discharge of his duties?—No.

1392. You never heard him at any time complain that he was not supported by me?—Certainly not.

1393. *Mr. Blair.*] You say that Mr. Brindley was quite satisfied that the boulders were put in 9 in. apart?—Yes.

1394. And that you gave them to him 9 in. apart?—Yes.

1395. Then how do you account for these letters I read the other day, in which Mr. Brindley complained bitterly of his instructions about the packing not having been carried out?—I think he was writing complaining of the portion I have already described.

1396. Which portion was that?—The portion in the extreme south block that I have already referred to.

1397. This is what he writes: "I must again protest against the way Mr. Gore instructs his
10—H. 7.