3120. I am not talking about sinking?—Yes; that is just what you are doing.

3121. You say it would support it from sinking. It cannot sink without causing friction against the bank at the back, and that would help it a little. Then, it would have a tendency to support the wall from sinking vertically, and it would have a tendency to throw it over as well?—The earth-pressure would.

3122. You have shown in your evidence—and I have every reason to believe that your theodolite is perfectly correct—that from pier 1 to pier 8 there is little more than ½in. out of level—⅝in. Supposing that has sunk ⅝in., are you prepared to say that that will account for all of the cracks in the building, or for a majority of the cracks in the building, or for half of them—would it account for half of them?—It would account for a great many of them. That and the sinking of the middle wall and of the partitions, as I said, accounted for all the cracks.

3123. Would that account for the cracks in the pier at the north end of No. 2 Block, at the north-west angle of Block No. 2 (north)? Would it account for these and for its being out of the perpendicular?—Yes, before the entrance-door. The thrust from the colonnade-wall has bulged that out.

3124. To what extent has that been bulged out?—That I can hardly say unless you tell me what state it was in when it was built.

3125. I want to know what it was when you measured it?—I gave you all these measurements before: 2⅜in., and 2¼in., and 2⅜in. is the greatest overhang there.

3126. Very well, then: if there was a settlement of ½in. in 80ft., would that cause the north wall to bulge out 2⅜in.?—It has caused it, in my opinion. I have not the slightest doubt about it.

3127. Say there is a wall 80ft. long and 40ft. high, and it sinks ½in., how far——?—It is not 40ft. high; it is only 26ft. high.

3128. Supposing a case. If it sinks only ½in. in 80ft., how much out of plumb will it be at 40ft. at a right angle?—I never worked that out.

3129. Do you not know that if it sinks ½in. in a length of 80ft. it can only be ¼in. out in a height of 40ft.? How much do you say that it would throw it out from being plumb at the top?—I do not know how the building was, to begin with. I know it has been crushed back at the north end, and that the effect of that has been multiplied by the height of the wall. The thrust has pushed the wall out, and whatever its effect it has been multiplied by about at least three times at the top; but I do not say that the wall was plumb, to begin with.

3130. But you also said in your former evidence that all the cracks in the north wall of the north wing are due to bulging rather than to settlement?—I think so. There are only a few cracks over there, where the wall has bulged out.

3131. And you think this ½in. of settlement in 80ft. caused this?—It may have been more than ½in. I do not know how much it may be; they may all have gone down for all I know. There is that difference of ½in. now between the pillars.

3132. You said in your former evidence that you wondered the building had not sunk more?—Yes, I did.

3133. What was your reason?—Because the foundations are so narrow.

3134. And still they have only settled ½in. in 80ft.?—I told you I did not know how much they had settled absolutely.

3135. There is now only ½in. difference in 80ft.?—Not in 80ft. Between No. 1 and No. 7 pillars they sank ½in.

3136. But you show a variation of the pillars all through. Do you not think, instead of this ½in. of settlement accounting for the cracks, that it is more likely to be a movement of the earth that caused them?—A movement of the earth in which direction?

3137. From the north-east?—That would give a tension in the colonnade-wall, and this is a thrust.

3138. Do you not think that the theory that this ground moved in that direction would account for the cracks easier than the theory of this having settled ½in. in 80ft.?—I do not think it would, because there is a severe thrust at the south end of the colonnade—that there can be no doubt of—and the movement you describe would give no thrust there.

3139. You said in your evidence previously that this colonnade was 16½in. out of being in line with the ambulatory of No. 1 ward —I think 16¼in.

3140. If you were told that it was built perfectly straight how would you account for its being 16½in. out now?—I should doubt the accuracy of the statement that it was built straight. It is a much easier thing to make a mistake in setting out than for a whole building to slip without injury all that distance.

3141. If Mr. Brindley who set out the work, was to tell you, as he has told the Commissioners, that he set out the place, before the brickwork was erected, that he worked to a line, and could not possibly be out more than 1½in.—supposing he were to say he was satisfied of that, how would you account for the 16½in.?—It is impossible to account for them—the two are irreconcilable; but I do not believe it, all the asme.

MONDAY, 27TH FEBRUARY, 1888.

Mr. A. T. BRINDLEY recalled and further examined.

Mr. Gore said that he should like to bring forward another witness, who would be in a position to substantiate what he was about to say; or perhaps, if there is no objection, he would make the statement and throw the onus on the Public Works Department or on Mr. Brindley of bringing forward the witness in question, whose name and residence he would give to them, or of disproving what he (Mr. Gore) intended to say. He suggested this course simply in order to save time.

Mr. Blair: I understood that no new evidence was to be brought forward. The case was really closed on Saturday, and we are to-day simply for the purpose of commenting upon the evidence that has been given.