

136. And is the same provision made there for the light and air wells as would be the case when the building is finally finished?—Quite the same.

137. Then, the suggestion is that that should be connected with the present Government House?—Yes, the Government House should remain until that portion was completed.

138. By building that pink portion first, Chambers would be provided for members of both branches of the Legislature, except, I take it, that the Legislative Council would not be in the Chamber which they would finally occupy when the whole building was completed?—Yes, exactly so. The Chamber for the House of Representatives would be built, but there would be a temporary building for the Upper House.

139. Where would that be?—In the north-west corner, in the front.

140. The Lower House would have the permanent Chamber erected, and in the meantime the Council would go in front of that light area opposite the Lower House Chamber, and once there we could go on with the proposed plan on the Government House site?—Yes.

141. *Mr. W. Fraser.*] Is the brown portion marked on the plan the area of the present Government House?—Yes.

142. Well, you could not leave the Government House intact, because the space where the new Chambers would be is right in the centre?—But it could be kept intact. [Explained on plan.]

143. *The Chairman.*] Could Parliament be kept sitting without being disturbed by this building going on?—Yes, that is quite clear. I might point out that the present bridge connecting the House with the library would be affected—we should require to make another connection with the bridge; but that is a minor matter.

144. *Right Hon. Sir J. G. Ward.*] How long do you reckon it would take to erect the 90,000-pound portion of the House on the Government House site?—At least two years.

145. And how long would it take to complete the alterations to the old Parliamentary Buildings site?—About the same time.

146. Is there not much less work in the 90,000-pound job?—There is less, but still there is a lot of work to do.

147. How long would it take to prepare the plans and specifications for a job like this?—About six months for working-drawings. Of course, it would be necessary to consult the heads of the Departments in regard to details of accommodation. It would take two years to build from the time we commenced after getting the drawings.

148. *Mr. E. McKenzie.*] Supposing you were to offer a reasonable bonus to have it completed in twelve or eighteen months, could you not get it done—there is plenty of space on the ground?—I am taking into consideration the general way building is conducted in Wellington. If you got an American contractor he would run it up in twelve months, no doubt. There are contractors here who would do it in less time, but in our experience that is the average time for large buildings.

149. *Mr. Barclay.*] Is the six months for the preparation of the specifications included in the two years?—No.

150. *Right Hon. Sir J. G. Ward.*] If the Public Works Department were to take the job in hand, put on a number of men, and go fast about it, would they do it quicker?—Yes, much quicker. If we were to do it by day-labour we might make a start in three months.

151. *Mr. Massey.*] Is it not a fact that day-labour was a failure in connection with the old Parliamentary Buildings?—That was co-operative labour.

152. What is the difference between co-operative labour and day-labour so far as the labour is concerned?—There would be no contracts, and no conflicts between the various tradesmen. In several cases by day-labour we have carried out works for 30 per cent. less than the lowest tender.

153. *Right Hon. Sir J. G. Ward.*] As an architect, Mr. Campbell, which do you consider is the most desirable place of the two on which to erect this building?—I do not think any architect could have two opinions on the subject. I think one site is wholly unsuitable for the erection of an important public building, on account of the fact that one-half of the ground is made-up ground, the spoil from the excavation of Hill Street. It is also most unsuitable for the erection of an important public building, on account of its narrowness; and then, in addition, Hill Street is 20 ft. above the level of Sydney Street, the difference in the levels making the site unsuitable for the satisfactory erection of an important public building. I have never seen an important public building erected on such a site with such difference in the levels. If the building was erected there, you would have one part of the building overtopping the other, and, although you could have that in a departmental building, you could not very well have it in an important building like this.

154. *Mr. W. Fraser.*] In the event of our taking the old Parliamentary Buildings site for departmental buildings, would the building you are suggesting permit of another story being put on in the event of the accommodation not being sufficient in the future?—That could easily be arranged by making the walls stronger.

155. You have not provided for that?—No, not at present. It would mean a very trifling amount to be added to the estimate.

156. *Hon. Mr. Hall-Jones.*] Each wall would have to be 4½ in. thicker?—Yes.

157. *Mr. W. Fraser.*] I want to know what the extra cost would be to carry one extra story up, assuming the walls to be suitable?—The cost would be trifling.

158. Do you not think it would be wise to do so?—Considering the congested state of the buildings, it would mean less satisfactory ventilation; and I think, if you raised the buildings higher than shown on this plan, the question of lighting would come into account.

159. You propose to cover these wells in the light areas with white tiles?—With white enamel bricks.

160. What is the size of the wells?—The two larger wells are 80 ft. by 61 ft., and the two smaller 48 ft. by 40 ft. That is to allow the sunlight to get in.