

161. *Mr. Barclay.*] I should like to know whether it would be possible for you to give us an estimate of what it would cost to provide a number of members' rooms—small rooms, say 10 ft. by 12 ft., to which a member could take a constituent or any other person with whom he wished to speak, and in which he could do his writing. Would it be possible to give us an estimate of the number of rooms of that sort that could be provided, and the probable cost?—In connection with the new building?

162. Yes?—Yes, I could supply those particulars.

163. There would be forty or fifty rooms required?—Yes, I could supply the particulars.

164. *Mr. Massey.*] How is it that the plans for the building on the Government House site are so much more elaborate than the plans for the building on the old Parliamentary Buildings site?—That may be explained in this way: that the plans for the building on the old site were necessarily prepared subject to the building which already existed on that site. The present library building is not quite the best style of architecture, and I followed very much the style of the building already in existence.

165. That would not account for the colouring?—I see the colouring is a little stronger in one than in the other, but the Government Printer is responsible for that.

166. *Right Hon. Sir J. G. Ward.*] What is the distance between the Chamber of the House of Representatives and the Legislative Council in the old building and the distance between the two Chambers in the new building?—The distance between the two Chambers in sheet No. 2—that is, on the Government House site—would be 42 ft.—just the width of the lobby—and in the old building the distance was 154 ft.

TUESDAY, 25TH AUGUST, 1908.

JOHN CAMPBELL further examined. (No. 1.)

1. *Right Hon. Sir J. G. Ward.*] I desire to know, Mr. Campbell, whether you have any further plans here?—Yes, I have copies of a sketch-plan of the suggested new Government House.

[Plan produced and put in, marked "Ex. D."]

2. *Mr. W. Fraser.*] I asked for the production of the old plans of the former building towards which they were working when the Sydney Street contract was cancelled?—I have them here.

3. *The Chairman.*] This plan of the suggested new Government House, I presume, assumes a level site, does it not?—Not necessarily level, but approximately level.

4. It is drawn for a level site?—Yes, quite so.

5. *Right Hon. Sir J. G. Ward.*] In regard to this plan, I should like to ask what is the maximum cost according to the design of this plan?—£25,000.

6. Is it as large as the present Government House?—The public rooms are larger in every case, but there are not so many bedrooms.

7. *The Chairman.*] It does not afford quite so many rooms?—Not quite so many as at present.

8. *Mr. W. Fraser.*] How many rooms short are there?—I think there are two bedrooms short.

9. *The Chairman.*] Have you been supplied with a list of the Governor's general staff and household?—The bedroom accommodation is sufficient for the staff. The accommodation is also sufficient for the servants. There are fifteen bedrooms for all requirements in addition to seven servants' bedrooms.

10. *Right Hon. Sir J. G. Ward.*] The chief point is this: Is the accommodation in regard to the bedrooms proposed in this new Government House sufficient for the permanent staff of the Governor judging by the staff of the present Governor and former Governors?—Quite sufficient. There are fifteen bedrooms for the family.

11. *The Chairman.*] As regards the accommodation required by the Governor for public functions, how does the proposed ballroom which is 66 ft. by 25 ft. compare with the ballroom of the present Government House?—It is fifty per cent. larger than the present ballroom.

12. Do you mean in length?—Chiefly in length. It is 1 ft. wider, with the bay windows additional. You might say the average width is 2 ft. greater than the present ballroom, and it is 20 ft. longer. It is practically a half larger than the present ballroom.

13. *Mr. W. Fraser.*] It is not wide enough—that was the fault?—If you make it wider it would be almost necessary to make it double the width, because it is now only wide enough for one set, and if you make it any wider it should be made double the width, to accommodate two sets.

14. *Hon. Mr. Guinness.*] Why cannot it be 10 ft. wider? There is no reason why it should not be?—I have confined it within the estimate of £25,000. About £1,000 more would provide a ballroom 10 ft. wider.

15. *The Chairman.*] How does the superficial area of the proposed new dining-room compare with the superficial area of the old dining-room—the floor-space?—The new dining-room is proposed to be 866 ft. and the old one is 836 ft.—practically the same.

16. *Mr. W. Fraser.*] What are the dimensions?—The old dining-room is 38 ft. by 22 ft. and the proposed new dining-room would be 31 ft. by 28 ft.

17. Could not that dining-room be extended where the bay window is, and make it longer?—Yes, it could be extended both in width and length without affecting the cost materially or the general plan. It could go out another 10 ft. almost: it could be made 28 ft. by 41 ft.

[The Hon. Mr. Guinness moved that the ballroom be widened to 40 ft., which was agreed to by the Committee.]

18. *Mr. W. Fraser.*] That would not affect the upper story?—No, not at all.