

75. You really felt it when you were walking through?—Yes.

76. In answer to Mr. Wilford you said that you found that these accumulations were recurring?—Yes.

77. That is, of course, coming back?—They were there on different occasions.

78. Does that mean that they disappeared or were removed, and that other gas came in similar quantities?—I could not answer that question. I am only speaking of my examination.

79. I wanted to find out the meaning of your own language. Mr. Wilford said “recurring” and you agreed. I want to see whether you mean that?—It is not fair to ask me to swear that that was the same gas.

80. I want to know what you meant by the evidence you gave this morning. You said you found large accumulations of gas at recurring intervals?—Yes.

81. Was that gas of the same kind—is that what you meant?—That is so.

82. Do I understand you to say that what you meant was that the gas had been removed from time to time, and then that the gas came back again?—I could not say.

83. Do you suggest that it was the same body of gas?—I do not suggest anything.

84. You do not suggest anything?—Not as regards that.

85. Either the gas remained or it was removed?—That is clear.

86. What is your opinion: did it remain in its original state, or was it removed and did it come back later?—I could not answer that question. All that I know is that the gas was there several times.

87. I am afraid that is not sufficient. You said you found the gas at recurring intervals—that was, that there was gas there from time to time?—I will not swear that that was the same gas. All that I know was that the gas was there.

88. Was the gas removed after your report had been made in the book?—I do not know.

89. Did you always report the presence of gas?—Yes; I saw by the book that it was removed, according to Mr. McGill’s report, and I expect that is right.

90. If you found gas and you reported it in the book, and then afterwards you did not find gas on your subsequent visit, would the inference be that it had been removed or become diffused?—If we found gas on one visit, and then the next time there was no gas, any intelligent person would know that the gas has been removed or diluted.

91. Your conclusion, as an intelligent person, would be that the gas had been removed or dissipated?—Yes.

92. How long were you inspecting?—I was not inspecting—only assisting.

93. How long?—Two years.

94. I suppose that you would consider that 33,600 cubic feet of gas was a dangerous quantity?—Yes.

95. Would you not consider it your duty to report that quantity either to the underviewer or the manager, so as to endeavour to protect your fellow-men?—You will see that the underviewer was informed on both those occasions.

96. You informed the underviewer that there was over 30,000 feet of gas?—No, we did not mention any quantity. We brought him in and showed him the gas. On one occasion they disputed my accuracy. I said there was 2 per cent., and they said 7 per cent., but they went higher up than where I tested.

97. On one occasion you reported to the sub-manager the presence of gas, and he disagreed with you as to the quantity?—Yes.

98. Can you say whether anything was done by him or under his orders to remove that gas?—I would not know, but there must have been something done because there was none there next time.

99. Then something must have been done?—Yes.

100. And I suppose you passed this place once a week?—Yes.

101. So that you passed the place where there was 30,000 cubic feet of gas, say, one hundred times?—In two years; yes, easily.

102. And on two occasions only there were large accumulations?—Yes.

103. And they were removed or dissipated during the week?—Yes.

104. Was it a flare-out, or a small escape of gas which accumulated between the dates of your inspection?—It came from a feeder.

105. A small feeder emitting the gas all the time between the dates of your inspections?—Yes.

106. When you found the 33,000 feet of gas it must have been fairly stagnant: was it moving? If so, then the gas was being diffused by air-current?—Quite correct.

107. On the second occasion when you discovered the 30,000 ft. of gas, was the sub-manager there?—On the two occasions he was there.

108. Have you any idea whether proper steps were taken to dissipate that gas?—I suppose you are aware that we realized the danger when we went for the underviewer.

109. Have you any doubt that he did not take precautions?—I do not know.

110. The disappearance of the gas is the best proof?—That is so.

111. Do you know how the gas would be dissipated except in the natural way by ventilation?—I do not know any other way.

112. You do not know what special steps can be taken?—I know what should be done.

113. You should shift it with ventilation: was that done?—It must have been done, because the gas disappeared.

114. Did you report any inadequate ventilation near where this gas was?—The fact of the gas being there showed lack of air.

115. You made no special report about the 30,000 ft.: did you discuss with Wear the amount?—No.