use to the Company until the wharf was built, and the cost of constructing the wharf was in the neighborhood of $20,000.

116th Int. After this wharf was built, what proportion of all the Company's coal mined and sent to market, was accommodated by that wharf?

Answer. I do not recollect exactly what proportion; the increased facilities of the wharf over the old one, would not only have accommodated all the coal mined by the Company, but that of several other companies: I ought to have explained a little more; the quantity shipped was frequently regulated by the condition of the canal; the proportion shipped by the canal after the building of that wharf was greater than before.

117th Int. What was the actual cash value of the property on which that wharf was built, before the construction of the wharf thereon, and of whom was the same purchased?

Answer. I think I was asked that question upon my return from Cumberland, when I reported upon the wharf; I then fixed the value at from $3000 to $5000; I considered, myself, its true value to be $3000. It was bought from the officers of the Company, General Tyson and Capt Young. General Tyson was the President of the Company, a portion of the time, and Capt Young had acted as President a portion of the time; but I do not know whether he ever was formally elected; Capt Young lived here in New York I believe, and General Tyson lived in Maryland, but spent most of his time here.

Cross Examined again for Complainant.

346th Cross Int. Was the five to seven cents per ton, which you have mentioned as the charges at Browns wharf composed of two elements — 1st charges for wharfage, and secondly charges for expenses of shipping the coal?

Answer. That is my impression, that it embraced the two elements.

347th Cross-Int. In reaching the other wharf (being the present wharf) to the construction of which you have referred in your direct examination, was one cent per ton paid to the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, for the privilege of passing over a portion of its road, being a distance of from a mile and one eighth to a mile and one fourth?

Answer. My recollection is, that was the charge.

348th Cross-Int. Was there also a charge of two cents per ton from the Cumberland and Pennsylvania Railroad Company, for the privilege of transit over a portion of its road:

Answer. I think that was the charge; but it was not and additional charge, for in occupying the old wharf we were likewise subject to a charge, the amount of which I do not recollect, but the contract will show; but I dont think it varies much from the above charge of two cents per ton, and the Company, by its present arrangements, is exempt from the use and wear and tear of this road to the old wharf, which I think would be equivalent to the additional charge made by the Baltimore and Ohio Rail road and the Cumberland and Pennsylvania Rail road.

349th Cross-Int. Was the new wharf a much more convenient position for shipping, so as to give an advantage in taking up boats, and to make the same price of freight from that point down the canal, as from Browns wharf, practically a larger compensation for the boating?

Answer. It was much more convenient, and offered vastly increased facilities to the boatmen. One of the great inducements to the building and in favor of this new wharf, is that there is always a full supply of water, which was not the case at the old wharf, which we could not reach except by passing through a lock on the canal to Mills' Creek, and then poling up to the wharf, which, in consequence of the bar, was frequently difficult to reach.

350th Cross-Int. Do the other companies shipping coal by the canal, ship from points in the neighborhood of or similarly situated with the old wharf, which you have spoken of as Brown's wharf?

Answer. They do.

351st Cross-Int. You have explained Mr. Mehaffey, about the contract alluded to in your testimony before Mr. Gorder, will you be good enough to state whether the fittings up and the appurtenances which constituted the facilities for working the Hoffman mine, were not all provided by the Cumberland Coal and Iron Company?

Answer. My impression is that nearly all, if not all, were paid by the Cumberland Coal and Iron Company.

352nd Cross-Int. Be good enough to look at Complainants' Exhibit S.P. No 5. Mr. Loomis stated such Exhibit to be a copy of a bill of John A. Green the original of which is Exhibit S.P. No 4, sent by him to Mr. Henderson, in order that the items therein contained, which were used at the Hoffman mine, should be designated; look at the said two papers, and distinguish if you are able any items which were bought for the use of the Hoffman mine?

Answer. I have looked at the papers, and I recognize the charge for an engine which was for the Hoffman mine, and a number of cars and car wheels; but I would not undertake to say or designate the precise number of items which were for the use of the Hoffman mine. I recognize a Worthington pump, which I recollect was purchased as part and parcel of that engine.

353d Cross-Int. Under date of March 12th 1857, do you observe two pillow-blocks and brasses; state if you do not recognize them as for the used said engine and boiler?

Answer. I do; and also May 6th, 1857, a large pillow-block and steam-escape pipe.

354th Cross-Int. Under date December 3d 1856, I observe one hundred and three cast-iron rollers; will you state what they are, whether they are any part of the mining-car?

Answer. My impression is, they were designed for what is termed the Slope mine at the Hoffman mine.

355th Cross-Int. About how many mine-cars, according to your best recollection were furnished for the Hoffman Mine?

Answer. My impression is, there were some forty or fifty cars.

356th Cross-Int. What was the value per car?

Answer. I think in the neighborhood of $30 or $35, I am not certain which. But am more inclined to the opinion that it was $35 per car.

357th Cross-Int. You mentioned also in your former testimony before Mr. Gorder some scales; be good enough to state more fully what scales you alluded to.