77. Would you have ever considered the necessity of such a course being in doubt if you had previously known what you do now?—No.

78. Was your report in reference to the Taupiri Mine written without the knowledge that you now have?—Yes. I stated in the beginning of my evidence that my report was written in answer to certain specific questions put to me by the Minister of Mines.

79. And has that knowledge made you feel the necessity for giving evidence to show that what you now know modifies that report considerably, and in regard to safety-lamps nullifies it?—No, modifies that report. I should like to take this opportunity to say that that report would have been modified if I had known that considerable quantities of gas were issuing from the fall in No. 5 bord. My report was written in answer to a specific question as to whether it would be safe to continue working in similar mines until a supply of safety-lamps could be obtained. I said I would not stop such a mine provided two precautions were taken—a strict examination for gas, and that the dust should be rendered harmless.

80. You would never, however, have written that report if you had been seised of the conditions as you now know them?—I should not have written it in that way.

81. Should the owners of the Taupiri Mine in future be allowed to work those mines without safety-lamps?—No.

82. Are you aware that the dust found in the Taupiri Mine is more highly explosive than is generally the case?—I am now.

83. Were you awere of that when you wrote that report to the Minister?—No.

84. Were you aware of it when you were interviewed by the *New Zealand Herald* reporter in Auckland before you had come to the mine at all?—I was not interviewed by the *New Zealand Herald* reporter in Auckland on the Huntly disaster.

85 Where were you first interviewed in regard to the Taupiri Mine, when you gave that information in regard to coaldust: in Wellington, was it?—I am sorry, but I do not remember.

86. You say that you now know that the dust found in the Taupiri Mine is more highly explosive than is generally the case: when did you find that out?—Last Sunday (27th September).

87. Do you consider that a dusty travelling-road in a mine of, say, 8 ft. in width, in which 2 ft. in the centre is watered, is a safe protection against danger, or merely a minimizing of it?—It would have no effect, I should judge.

88. Can you tell me what quantity of this highly explosive dust would cause an explosion?—Such a quantity that, being raised into the air as a cloud, would weigh about half an ounce per cubic foot of air.

89. Do you mean by that that a minimum explosion would be produced, or would it be an explosion of any magnitude?—No, that would propagate a violent explosion, if stirred up in the form of a cloud.

90. By a horse's hoof?—No.

91. How then?—It must be a sudden violent concussion.

92. It would have to be a very powerful force?—Yes, and a sudden one, which would cause a concussion.

93. Do you consider that doors opening to old workings should be marked "Dangerous" for the safety of the men?—I am afraid my opinion would be useless on that point.

94. Do you know whether it is done at Home?—We have few old workings at Home that are open.

95. Do you know whether it is done at Home?—I do not know.

96. What would be an extra precaution to adopt?—To mark up "Dangerous" on a door where the men go through would be no precaution.

97. Should not all disused workings in which there might be possible accumulations of gas be guarded by notices of some kind?—My own experience shows that merely marking with notices is not much good. Locking the doors would be more effective.

98. I understand that you came to your conclusion in regard to the highly explosive quality of this dust from analysis?—No, I actually tested it.

99. I think you went down the mine with Mr. Bennie, Inspector of Mines, the first time?—Yes.

100. On the 14th September?—Yes.

101. The second time was last Tuesday, the 29th September?—Yes.

102. On the 14th September you went with Mr. Bennie and were down about three or four hours?—Something like that—I am not sure of the time.

103. Did you get any of the samples which you tested when you were with Mr. Bennie?—I got samples that day. I am not sure whether Mr. Bennie was present when I took them.

104. Do you tell me that you took any samples that day out of the mine?—Yes, I do.

105. I am talking about dust?—No, I thought you meant coal.

106. Where did you get your samples of dust which you tested?—The one I tested last week I got from the coal which I ground up.

107. But did you not get that piece of coal out of a coal-scuttle?—No.

108. Did you take a piece of coal in the hotel here?—Yes, I did. I have that.

109. Had you any samples for testing, except the piece you took out of the coal-scuttle, when you went to Wellington to the Royal Oak? Had you any samples in your possession from the Taupiri Mine except the "grab" sample which came from the coal-scuttle in the Huntly hotel, when you went to Wellington before you wrote that report to the Minister?—I understand your question to be: had I any samples of coal out of the mine when I left here for Wellington, where I wrote that report. Yes, I had.