

690. How much is it out?—You are talking of the concrete floor?
691. The bases?—The greatest difference is $\frac{1}{2}$ in.
692. Do you mean to tell us candidly that the sinking of $\frac{1}{2}$ in. is the whole proof that you have of the mischief?—Not the whole proof; it is part of the proof.
693. I am speaking of the sinking—vertical settlement?—That is what it measures.
694. Is that the whole of the evidence you have of this mischief?—Not the whole evidence.
695. I am speaking of the vertical settlement?—That is what I find it to measure.
696. But there is no other?—Yes.
697. What other?—The bursting of the wall at one end.
698. Do not go away from the subject, if you please. You told us distinctly that the settlement of the ambulatory-wall was the root of the whole evil?—Yes.
699. And now you tell us again you have only a measure of $\frac{1}{2}$ in. to show it?
- Mr. Blair*: Ambulatory-walls.
700. *Mr. Lawson*.] Walls if you like?—The pillars.
701. I will give you another inch if you like, or two, or three, or six even, so that you can see it with your eyes?—You can see it with your eyes now.
702. You can see nothing there. By measurement you have only $\frac{1}{2}$ in. to speak to?
- Mr. Skinner*: I think Mr. Hay said the sill at the intermediate wing and the sill at the north wing were something like about 2 in. out.
- Mr. Lawson*: But, still, I am speaking of a certain point, and upon a certain statement. He said distinctly that the settlement of that one wall—the ambulatory-wall—was the whole root of the matter, and $\frac{1}{2}$ in. only was the whole measurement he had to show for it; and does he mean to come here as a man of common-sense, not to say of learning, and tell us that that $\frac{1}{2}$ in. of settlement in a distance of 70 ft. has caused all the mischief?
- Mr. Blair*: I submit that these remarks are altogether uncalled-for.
- Mr. Lawson*: I am speaking upon a statement made by an expert.
- The Chairman*: You can put a plain question and get a plain answer.
- Mr. Lawson*: That is a plain question and a plain answer. He says it is out $\frac{1}{2}$ in. and that is all, and I wish that distinctly taken down.
703. *The Chairman*.] At what point is this?—Those different measurements at the bases of the columns. Nos. 3, 4, 5, and 6 from the south end are lower than Nos. 1 and 7.
704. *Mr. Gore*.] You said that the piers are overhanging towards the sea?—Yes; some of them are. That was with regard to line.
705. Some of them are perpendicular?—That was with regard to the line.
706. Will you be kind enough to tell me what positions the piers are in?—Which way do you want them?
707. I should like to see them perpendicular all through; I heartily wish it. I will put it to you in this way: Have the piers been running towards the sea from their base?—Some of them have—the northern ones have.
708. How do the southern ones run? Are they perpendicular?—I have only taken every second pillar. The second one—No. 2—leans inward $\frac{3}{4}$ in.; No. 4 leans outward $\frac{3}{4}$ in.; No. 6 is the same; No. 7 leans inward.
709. That has been sufficiently explained in your evidence. I now come to the question Mr. Lawson asked you when you gave the levels of the piers at their bases. Now, No. 1 is 0.01 higher than No. 2, No. 3 is lower than No. 2, No. 4 is of the same level as No. 3, No. 5 is 0.01 higher than No. 4, No. 6 is of the same height as No. 4?—Of the same height as Nos. 3 and 4.
710. No. 7 is the same height as No. 5, but No. 5 is less than No. 1?—0.05.
711. There is a difference of 0.05 between the whole nine piers, is there not?—Yes.
712. That is a great difference?—Yes.
713. Would that account for the bulging-out of these piers?—It would not account for the bulging-out.
714. Not to the extent of $\frac{3}{4}$ in.?—It is $\frac{1}{2}$ in. to $\frac{3}{4}$ in.
715. Does it show rents in the concrete under these piers?—You have too much concrete for that.
716. But surely, if there are such heavy cracks as you have described to us—I have not seen the building myself for four years—what do you say they have been caused by?—By the settlement of the foundations.
717. I should rather imagine it would eat into them; and I have had thirty years' experience of foundations?—Oh, no.
718. You think that $\frac{1}{2}$ in. settlement would be sufficient to account for all these cracks?—Yes.
719. You say that the corridor-floor is narrower at the centre than it is at each end?—At one place it is.
720. You also stated in your evidence that the piers have not movement at their bases?—In which way?
721. Outward?—I told you that they were out of line, some downhill and others uphill.
722. Out at the base?—Yes.
723. Are they much out?—As I explained before, they are $\frac{7}{8}$ in. out uphill, and $\frac{3}{4}$ in. downhill.
724. Is that at the base?—No.
725. But I want it at the base, or at the level of the floor if the piers are not out of line at their base?—I never measured that.
726. When the concrete wall came forward, if it did so, why did you not make the floor narrower in the centre?—I could not without throwing the concrete out.
727. But, as a matter of fact, you did not make it narrower?—My acquaintance with the building began in November last. There is greater curvature in the back wall than in the front wall and in the centre wall. I have explained that already.