

September, 1882, says, in writing to Mr. Lawson: "During my absence from the job to bring in certificate to town on Saturday last, about five thousand or so of very bad bricks have been run out of the last two kilns, and, having mixed with the rest, it is impossible to pick them out. What should I do under the circumstances? The best of the kilns are but just passable, being rather shaky. I see no other course but to condemn the lot. If I do this, I expect it will stop the job. Would you telegraph what had better be done, or come out to-morrow morning?" I do not know what was done. On the following morning Mr. Brindley again wrote: "On getting further into the stack the bricks are even worse, some of them having scarcely seen fire at all. Out of a day's work, about five or six hundred have been picked out. I must, in justice to the work, condemn the lot, which I shall do to-morrow, if I do not hear from you. Unless this is done, it seems to me Mr. Gore or any of his men are to be the judge of material, and not the Inspector; and I may say it is a piece of sharp practice on the brick-burners' part to run them out during my absence, in face of my repeated instructions that they should not do so, when kilns are being emptied." Mr. O'Connor also refers to this question of bricks. In continuation of the extract already read, he says: "Continuing along the building-works, Mr. Ussher and myself then came to a stack of bricks, and from force of habit, or curiosity, I picked up two of these and struck them together, and was astonished to find that, instead of giving a clear, sharp ring, as they should have done, they gave out a dull, sullen thud, indicating either that the clay was bad, or else that the bricks were badly burnt. I therefore resolved to inform you about this also, and did so, I believe, next morning, as I was clearly of opinion that no large building could safely be erected with bricks of that kind. When I informed you accordingly, you seemed to be very much annoyed that such work should be permitted, and you immediately sat down and wrote a note to Mr. Lawson, as I understood it, on the subject. I do not think that I read the note, therefore cannot say what you put in it. I do not think it was written officially or copied, as I believe you put it in an envelope, and sent it off at once; but I happened to meet Mr. Lawson the very next morning, or a day or two afterwards, on the railway-platform at Dunedin Station on his way to Seacliff, and I concluded that he was going there in pursuance of what you wrote to him, and I think I mentioned to you afterwards that your note had had prompt attention." With reference to the brick question, Mr. Ussher will also corroborate in evidence the statements that are here made by Mr. O'Connor and myself, Mr. O'Connor's memorandum also refers to beams that were too weak. The matter was rectified, so it is unnecessary to enlarge on it. I, however, put in the memorandum, as it shows the relations that existed between the department and the Architect. [Document No. 4 produced.] From Mr. Brindley's correspondence it appears that there are other matters in the way of defective materials in regard to which the Contractor practically placed the Inspector at defiance, and I can find no record of the Inspector having been backed up by the Architect. On the 23rd May, 1883, Mr. Brindley writes to Mr. Lawson: "I have to call your attention to the thickness of the gable-wall at the end of the Block 2 (south)—the one I spoke to you about on last visit to town. Mr. Gore insists on same being an extra, and has built it 9in. thick, and informs me he intends to write you and charge the same as extra. As all the roof and gables are 14in. thick, there is no reason why this should not be; and, as it is not an extra, I must request you to ask Mr. Gore to make the same proper thickness, as he will not do it for me. It is very annoying to have to make so many complaints, but it seems as if the same game was to be tried as some months back—that is, ignore my instructions, and do work for you but not for me, even though from your instructions. As I will not have this, and consider the only way to bring Mr. Gore to his senses is to touch him in the pocket, I shall refuse to pass certificate for brickwork of this block next month. It is just a trick to get out of 4½in. of wall. Mr. Gore also informs me that he intends to charge for 11in. by 4in. joists, &c." And on the 1st June, referring to this gable, Mr. Brindley again writes: "In the matter of the gable, of which I wrote last week, Mr. Gore's manager says he will not take it down, and generally defies me or any one else to make it be removed. I have given written notice to Mr. Gore, and must refer you to clause 9 of General Conditions to withhold payment of certificate till such time as it is altered." A further question then arose with reference to cement. On the 4th June, 1884, Mr. Brindley wrote to Mr. Lawson as follows: "I have to call your attention to the cement Mr. Gore is using—viz., Brooks, Shoulbridge, and Co.'s. The only brands specified are White's or Knight Bevan's. The manner of Mr. Gore getting such cement on the ground and starting to use it is anything from right, as up to mid-day on Tuesday no cement was on the ground, but during my absence in town yesterday four trucks, or about a hundred casks, of above brands were delivered, and a start was made on foundations. I therefore have given notice to Mr. Gore's manager to stop using any more, it not being of approved specified brands. I have taken this stand to protect myself, as it seems to be the starting-point of Mr. Gore's sending up further unapproved material, if not objected to, as it would also give an opening for any rubbish being sent up that he might think fit; also, if he is allowed to deviate from the specifications, because it does not suit him, any authority I have as Inspector is gone, and the Government might just as well save my salary, and let him have his own way of carrying out the work. The job would, under the arrangement as understood by Mr. Gore, seem to be summed up in the words, 'this was understood,' and 'that was intended,' as the case suited him." We have a similar difficulty with reference to the lead. On the 10th of September, 1884, Mr. Brindley wrote complaining that 5lb. lead was being laid down, instead of 6lb., on the laundry.

*Mr. Gore*: This is nothing to do with the present inquiry. I had nothing to do with the laundry.

*The Chairman*: Was that Mr. Gore's work?

*Mr. Blair*: It was transferred to Mr. Gore's son, but Mr. Gore started it.

*Mr. Gore*: I have no objection to the matter coming out.

*The Chairman*: It is no part of the asylum contract.

*Mr. Gore*: I have no objection to the statement, but it is not evidence. I should prefer the matter coming out, because the parties who put the lead on will be called.