foundations under the piers, as they are and as they were designed, is that the kind of plan you would have made?—No; I would have shown 3ft.

926. Or whatever thickness they may have been?—Yes.

927. Can you possibly from this plan draw a comparison between the strength of the two foundations?—No. The present foundations must be stronger, because you have a greater area of concrete underneath them. I mean a greater perpendicular area. It is only 1ft. thick here, and the 3ft. thickness of the present concrete foundations is much stronger than it would be, by 3ft. by 3ft. by 1ft. There is more concrete in the pier than is shown here.

928. You could not tell from this plan the relative strength of the two foundations?—No, not with that plan.

929. Could you possibly take a dimension from this plan of the foundation put in?—No; because they are differently constructed.

930. What I am speaking of is this: This is supposed to be the concrete foundation put in— these coloured portions: I ask you could you possibly from this plan tell the width of the foundations?—No, not the width.

931. Allowing that you had only this plan to go by, could you tell the thickness of the foundation?—No.

932. Could an engineer, a great mathematician, tell it?—No one could tell it; you could only assume.

933. If this plan was given to you to take out the quantities, the dotted lines showing the original plan, and the quantities of this foundation shown by the three-cornered coloured lines, would you think the man was in earnest who gave it to you, or laughing at you?—I would not take it; I would ask the dimensions.

934. Supposing any one gave you this plan to take the quantities of this cement off, as shown by the coloured drawing, what would you think of the man who gave it to you—would you think he knew his business?—Well, I should think he was trying to lead me astray.

935. *Mr. Lawson.*] Why would you think that?—Because there is nothing definite given you.

936. It is a plan of one side of the foundation?—Yes.

937. Nothing whatever on the plan to show another side at all?—No.

Mr. Gore: It does not profess to be anything but a plan of one side.

938. *Mr. Lawson.*] There is no thickness shown?—No.

939. Will you look at that plan [Exhibit 12]. Looking at that back wall of the north wing, and the rather peculiar kind of twisting that is all about the cracks, what would you attribute that to?—I should like first to see the wall.

940. You decline to answer the question?—I should like to see the wall first.

941. Keeping that in your hand still, if I were to tell you that the whole of these cracks arose from the subsidence of that ½in. Mr. Gore spoke about, would you not think I was perpetrating a huge joke upon you?—I would that. I cannot understand how the building can have sunk ½in. if these two piers are level.

942. But supposing it—allowing that to be the case—supposing there was really a vertical settlement of ½in., or ⅝in., or 1in. even, even a few inches, would you consider that that settlement would cause all these cracks in the back wall?—No, I do not think so.

943. Could it possibly do so?—I do not see where it could, because it would have a tendency mostly to crack it at the south end of the ambulatory—to split it up at the south end of the ambulatory.

944. But if the settlement was only ½in., how could it show anything?—If that settlement takes place in the 78ft. of the north ambulatory, upon the southern part, where it starts away, there would be a vertical crack of ¼in. at the top to nothing at the bottom.

945. Would not it be more likely that it would be distributed, and not appear at all?—I am assuming it would all go like in a body.

946. Is that at all likely?—It depends.

947. What I meant to ask is this: Supposing it commences at nothing in the south end and gradually gains all the distance till it reaches ⅝in. at the north end, so that there is ⅝in. of settlement in the whole length, is it not much more likely that it would show nothing at all, because it would be distributed over the whole wall?—No, it would have a greater tendency to show it open at this stationary point, the south end of the ambulatory; and, this building being 36ft. high, and the length of this being 72ft., it would give half the distance on the plumb at the north end, and likewise at the south end it would tilt over from the vertical.

948. If I were to tell you there were no such cracks, what then?—Well, I should say it has not settled at all off the level. It has not gone off the level, though it may have been pushed out at the bottom.

949. If in such a case there is no settlement?—There would be no cracks in the front.

950. When you were up at Seacliff you were measuring the concrete?—Yes.

951. Did you take notice of the kind of concrete?—It was ordinary metal and cement.

952. Did you find anything faulty?—No.

953. Nobody pointed out any faults?—No.

954. And you measured the whole of the concrete?—Yes; the whole of the concrete contained in these quantities.

955. No fault whatever was found at the time you were measuring?—No.

956. If it was proved by measurement that this north wing had slipped or moved 16½in. at the north end of the ambulatory-entrance, and that in the front of the bay-windows here, of the same north wing, it had moved 13½in., what would you attribute that to?—A sinking, and the bottom, here, drawn together.

957. Understand what I mean: both the movements are in the same direction, 16in. here and