to be rocking to and fro with a slight breeze, never having been properly built in."—(Inspector's Report, November, 1884.)

When at Seacliff I specially asked Dr. Neill to show me the worst of the defects referred to; and I saw nothing beyond what can be seen in any new building, public or private. Anything that can be called a defect is due to shrinkage of timber, and even of this there is less than usual, for the framing of the doors is Baltic deal. The bolts and hinges are certainly not trumpery. I had no opportunity of judging of the locks, but Mr. Gore, M.H.R., who had the contract for building the asylum, informs me that Dr. Neill was consulted before the order for them was sent Home, and that they were manufactured by the firm who makes most of the locks for English asylums. I may state here that, in details like this, Dr. Neill was consulted at every step during the erection of the building.

The window-beads are of the ordinary kind seen every day. Those that the patients were expected to interfere with are tightly fastened to the frames, but all others have only two or three nails, so as to be readily taken off, which is the usual practice. Assuming that it is considered necessary to do so, all the beads can be nailed tightly for £4 or £5.

With reference to door-frames being secured by wooden wedges, I saw none of them; and Mr. Gore asserts emphatically that none were used.

The window-frame, stated to have rocked in a slight breeze, lights the staircase leading to the roof. The wall inside is not plastered, and there are no architraves, so the window must have shaken loose, not in a slight breeze, but in one of the gales which blow so fiercely at this elevation. The window could have been secured for 5s.

Altogether there are 1,273 doors and windows in the Seacliff Asylum. It is impossible to assert that the fittings of the whole of them are absolutely perfect in a mathematical sense, which seems to be the standard aimed at. But, for all practical purposes, they are quite complete and well finished.

6. *Movement in Foundations.*

"I was sorry to notice that movement of the soil is still progressing beneath the female wing, as evidenced by cracked walls, falling plaster, and broken concrete pavement. This movement is evidently promoted by soakage of water from high ground at the rear of the building. It is highly desirable to provide against this soakage by laying down tar-pavement in the airing courts for a width of at least 12ft. from the walls, and by providing proper drainage to carry away the rainfall from them."—(Inspector's Report, November, 1884.)

"I have again to draw attention to the structural defects mentioned in my former reports. Movement continues to take place in the foundations of the female wing, in which a rent exists from roof to basement. Plaster is constantly falling, and alarming noises are at times heard in the timbers of the roof."—(Inspector's Report, May, 1885.)

This is really the only matter connected with the asylum that might have assumed a serious aspect. As there is a good deal of slipping ground in the neighbourhood fears were at first entertained that the whole slope of the hill was on the move. I am glad to say that these fears are groundless; there is clearly no general movement of the land.

The total length of the building is 570ft., and out of this there is only some 20ft. or 25ft. where the ground is not quite solid. After a careful examination of the building and ground, I came to the conclusion that, even in the small area affected, there is no great movement in any particular direction. The injury to the building is no more than might have been caused by irregular settlement in the foundations. That being the case, there will be no difficulty in preventing further damage. The impression, however, is that the movement has stopped. Dr. Neill himself thinks so, and Mr. Lawson, reporting to Mr. Ussher, the District Engineer, on the 6th July, 1885, says: "I have now the honour to inform you that, from measurements recently taken on the spot, I am in a position to state that no movement nor further extension of cracks in wall have taken place since, in company with Mr. Blair and yourself, I visited the building and examined the same. In other words, my former report as to this matter, of date 26th May last, is absolutely correct—namely, that the fracture in wall, caused by movement of strata, has not enlarged or extended since a trench was sunk, intercepting underflow of water-drainage, twelve months since, under direction of Public Works Department. Mr. Ussher himself, under date 14th instant, says: 'From observations during the past few months, I have come to the conclusion that the cracks in the building have increased but slightly, if at all, during the past year, and I have no doubt the stone drain in its present position has been effective.'"

As there is an erroneous impression abroad on the subject, I may explain that the damage done to the building by the settlement is very small, not nearly as much as in several large buildings in Dunedin, of which no notice is taken. The north wing is not in any way affected, the whole of the damage being confined to about 25ft. of the ambulatory, between the north and second wings, and the rooms overhead. I saw a good many cracks both in the walls and plaster, but none right through the walls, and, although conspicuous enough on the plaster inside, no one walking past the building would notice the cracks. I cannot, therefore, understand on what grounds the Inspector makes the statement that a "rent exists from roof to basement." If such a rent exists, how comes it that I found this part of the building occupied by patients? and so far as I can ascertain it was so occupied when the report was made.

That the Inspector does not really consider the movement in the building serious is shown by the simple remedy he proposes: putting down tar-pavements in the airing-court, and carrying away the rainfall from them.

It is quite clear that the movement in the ground has stopped altogether, or become so small as to be harmless. It would therefore be unnecessary to do anything further beyond repairing the cracks, were it not that recent borings show the ground to be soft. The drain put in at the back of the building is not deep enough to intercept all the water. Under these circumstances it is desir-