

The following is an analysis of the opinions expressed by the expert witnesses on the alleged defects of the Hospital, as above classified. Each witness is distinguished by a number, and those called by Dr. Batchelor are marked as "B.," and those by the Trustees as "T." The first column ("Disapprove") contains those who disapprove of the present arrangements, and the second column ("Approve") those who hold the opinion that the existing arrangements are satisfactory in each case.

Points in Expert Evidence.	Witnesses as per List.		
	Called by	Disapprove.	Approve.
(a.) Affecting the site .. .. .	B. T.	13 .. .. .	2. 15.
(b.) Faulty plan of construction .. .. .	B. T.	1, 2, 5, 6, 8. 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15.	
(c.) Imperfect system of ventilation, lighting, and heating ..	B. T.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16 ..	14.
(d.) Imperfect floors and walls .. .. .	B. T.	1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7. 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16 ..	14.
(e.) Overcrowding of wards .. .. .	B. T.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. 9, 11, 12, 15, 16 ..	10, 14.
(f.) Drainage .. .. .	B. T.	1, 2, 7, 8. .. .. .	11. 10, 11, 14.
(g.) Closets, &c. .. .. .	B. T.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 .. 9, 12, 13, 15.	
(h.) Baths and lavatories .. .. .	B. T.	1, 2, 5, 6, 7. 11, 13, 15.	
(i.) Special wards .. .. .	B. T.	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7. 9, 11, 15, 16 ..	9.
(j.) Special-case rooms .. .. .	B. T.	1, 2, 4, 7. 9, 11, 15, 16.	
(k.) Kitchens .. .. .	B. T.	1, 2. 13, 15.	
(l.) Nursing .. .. .	B. T.	1, 2. 12, 15.	
(m.) Convalescent wards .. .. .	B. T.	1, 2. 15.	
(n.) General sanitary condition .. .. .	B. T.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. 16 .. .. .	10, 14. 11, 12.
(o.) Fallowing wards .. .. .	B. T.	1, 3, 4 .. .. . 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8.	
(p.) New hospital .. .. .	B. T.	9, 16. 1, 2, 7, 8.	
(q.) Dangers require immediate remedy .. .. .	B. T.	9, 15, 16 .. .. .	10. 1, 2, 3, 4.
(r.) Domestic management .. .. .	B. T.	.. .. . .. .. .	
(s.) Results of practice .. .. .	B. T.	1, 4 .. .. . .. .. .	2. 11.

3. With few exceptions, the differences of opinion among the witnesses relate only to the degree in which the defects are important, and the strongest argument urged in defence of the present conditions is that many other hospitals are as bad, and that, notwithstanding the defects, the general results have been fairly good.

Upon careful consideration of the evidence the Commissioners feel satisfied that the complaints made have been largely supported by the testimony, and that some of the alleged defects are of a serious nature, and require immediate remedy.

(a.) *Affecting the Site.*—The site of the Hospital was originally set aside as a market-place. It has an area of 5 acres, and, taking the Hospital at one hundred and twenty beds, would give a proportional area of 1,815 square feet for each, which, according to Dr. Coughtrey's evidence, is considerably in excess of the usual proportion of area for city hospitals.

The site in its original state was a flax-swamp. At present it is dry, and laid out in gardens and lawns. The soil is loamy clay, averaging 4ft. in depth, resting on 1ft. of peaty soil, which again rests on 1ft. of blue clay, underlaid by coarse gravel to an unknown depth. The report that the section was at one time used as a depository for city refuse appears to be incorrect. The foundation of the main building was carried down to the gravel, and no evidence of any subsidence of the structure has been detected. There does not appear to have been any systematic subsoil-drainage of the area, a provision which is of vital importance to the health of an hospital, as otherwise the "ground air" must exercise a deleterious influence on the health of the patients. One witness only strongly disapproved of the site, but his objections were chiefly founded on the very unsatisfactory condition of the immediate neighbourhood of the Hospital, which he characterized as being at present the most unhealthy part of the city. This is on account of the very offensive condition of the foreshore of the bay, caused by the outfall of the city sewers into stagnant tidal pools at the back of the retaining-wall and railway embankment. From our inspection of this foreshore, even though in winter, we feel convinced that the complaint against its insanitary condition is well founded, and we fear that even the most strenuous efforts to improve the sanitation of the present Hospital may be defeated, if provision be not made for the thorough removal of the sewerage. Such provision is of especial importance in the case of the dejecta from a large hospital, which must naturally contain the germs of many forms of disease. It appears to us that, without trenching on the special work of the civil engineer, we may suggest that in conjunction with