736. And it was with reference to that particular pillar that he gave that answer: do you mean to say that Mr. Williams committed himself to a general statement that 6ft. pillars were sufficient in submarine workings?—(No answer.)

737. Mr. Reid.] What was the size of these pillars?—I took the average of thirty pillars

impartially, and found it 10.296 feet.

738. Mr. Chapman.] From what?—From the plan. 739. Mr. Reid.] What plan?—Mr. Twining's plan.

740. Mr. Chapman asked you just now with reference to your consulting authorities; you might as well tell us whether any of these authorities, and, if so, which of them, concurred with you? [Mr. Chapman objected to the question, which was disallowed.]

740A. Mr. Reid.] With reference to the falls about which you were asked just now: did you

receive any written information about the falls?-I did.

741. From whom?—From Mr. Bishop.

742. Hon. Mr. Stout. He was one of the men working in the mine?—He was surveyor of the mine

743. Mr. Reid.] At the time?—Not when I made the survey.

744. At the time you got this letter?—No; it was subsequently to his leaving. I wrote to him to ask if he had made a survey of the mine. I received, in reply, the letter now produced: "Brunner Mine, 16th February, 1883.—Dear Sir,—In reply to your inquiries re submarine workings, Shag Point Mine, I beg to say the plan shows extreme south workings from actual survey, except some bords, which were so fallen as not to be accessible. When at the Point I set off the main incline levels going north and south, also inclines driven up from levels, and from which the bords were turned away. Bords and other places were driven as thought best by the under-viewer. I will look up section of shaft and send them on to Mr. Williams, as he has already written for them. Mr. Twining has sections of both shafts.—Yours faithfully, J. Bishop.—G. J. Binns, Esq., Mines Inspector, Dunedin."
745. With reference to that, you say that is the information you got about the falls?—That is

the information I got about the falls and the surveys.

745a. You have seen the plan by Mr. Taylor: have you got it here?—No; it is among the ers in the possession of the Committee. [Plan produced.]
746. Have you compared this plan with Mr. Twining's?—I have.
747. What is the essential point of difference?—In one instance I find, on looking at papers in the possession of the Committee.

Mr. Twining's plans, that more bords and the excavations in the centre here, at the point marked A, are not shown. They materially weaken that portion of the mine.

748. The submarine portion?—-Yes.

749. Hon. Mr. Stout.] Who made this plan?—A man named Taylor, who was surveyor at the It bears his signature.

750. What is the date?—The 30th June, 1883.

751. Mr. Reid.] You were asked by Mr. Chapman whether your action in closing the mine was based on seeing Mr. Twining's plan, and you said not altogether: what were the other data that you went upon?—My impression after the inspection of the mine. From the first time I had been struck with its danger up to the very last moment on seeng Mr. Twining's plan, but I waited until I saw the plan in order to have the whole case before me before I decided.

752. The plan was confirmatory?—Merely confirmatory of my impression of the mine.

753. You were asked also several questions with reference to Mr. Williams and Mr. Rich protesting against your action in closing the mine: did you ever receive any written protest from Mr. Williams?—I have never received any written protest as to the danger to the roof and floor.

754. From letting the water in?—Yes.

755. Are you aware, of your own knowledge, of his ever having made any report, either to Mr. Maitland or to others, upon the danger of having closed the mine in that way, and allowing the water to come in?—The only report I am aware of is his report of the 30th June, which does not refer to the danger to the roof at all, as far as I have read it—and I have read it some hundreds of

756. You have heard the evidence of Mr. Denniston with reference to the average of the bords

shown?—Yes.

757. He has stated that, in some places, the pillars were 25ft. and 30ft. thick: did you find any pillars of that thickness in the mine?—There were pillars of that thickness, which I have already described as a source of danger.

758. In what way?—By upholding the roof in one part, abstracting the general average from

the roof, and causing irregularities in the support.

759. Mr. Macandrew. One of your reasons for ordering the suspension of pumping operations was, as I understand, that their continuance would have rendered it necessary to have one man down in the mine to work the pump, and that his life would have been in continual danger: is that so?—That is so.

760. Now, Mr. Denniston, in his evidence, affirms that there would have been no danger. you fortify your opinion as to this point by consultation with anybody else?—No; I had nobody to

consult with.

761. Well, might it have been possible to have pumped the mine without any one having been stationed underground, that is to say, by means of connecting gear from power situated beyond the reach of water?—It might have been possible to do that, but a man would have had to go down to attend to the pump. You could not leave a pump entirely by itself.

762. Did the breach of the Mining Act in respect of which you prosecuted the company refer

to the landward workings?—To the landward workings.

763. Not the workings now in question?—No; quite a different affair.
764. Well now, seeing the important and extensive interest, both public and private, involved