cruel and unkind as deponent would call it. His language was very profane. He cursed very hard and swore that he'd be damned if he did'nt make them all see the devil before morning. His wife begged deponent to stay there all night, but he thought that as it was so foggy, that he declined. He was not sober at that time, but not very drunk.

To the fourth interrogatory that he never heard Mr Watkins threaten to lay violent hands upon his wife. He has heard him swear that he would not manage the property any better, and that he would see the property out.

To the fifth interrogatory, that he has been acquainted with the property for three years. Mr Watkins had a manager on the property four years ago. Mr Watkins managed the property very badly. He does not pretend to stay at home. Deponent does not believe that Watkins gives an order to a servant once a week. It seems to be all his study to ride horse back. He never chides the servants when they did wrong. Deponent's knowledge of the mode of management does not extend further than the last year. Deponent went to live there in August eighteen hundred and fifty three. There was a crop of wheat in the shock at that time. He heard Watkins say he had saved forty bushels of it. At a moderate calculation there were a hundred bushels of it. The rest was torn to pieces by stock. There was also a crop of corn on shears growing on the ground at the time. Deponent does not think he made half as much as the property was worth. None of the fodder was saved. It was left to rot in the field. Brashears saved the corn. He was the man who worked the land on shears.

To the sixth interrogatory, that Watkins has no other property that deponent knows of, and is engaged in no business.

To the seventh interrogatory, that he does not know personally anything about his contracting debt.

To the eighth interrogatory, that defendant lives at the place where he and his wife formerly lived. Mrs Watkins lives with deponent at Taylorsville, where she moved last tuesday week.

To the ninth interrogatory, that Mr Watkins had and there are now remaining on the premises three negroes, horses, cows & some other stock. She has no other support than what this property yields together with sixty five acres of land which was assigned to her as deponent understood as dower in her first husband's estate. The farm has, since he has known it been loosing in value. The personal property has also depreciated. If the farm was well managed it is sufficient to support her, but according to the present management she cannot subsist.

And thereupon the said witness was examined upon the cross-interrogatories filed by the defendant's solicitor and returned herewith as aforesaid, and thereto he makes answer:

To the first cross interrogatory, that he did not urge or advise her.

To the second cross-interrogatory that he did not know his wife to urge or advise Mr Watkins to apply for a divorce. But on the contrary he has heard his wife caution and advise Mr Watkins the complainant to consider it before she proceeds further.

No other witnesses being produced the commission adjourned, to meet again on Friday August the tenth eighteen hundred and fifty four.

Friday August the tenth eighteen hundred and fifty four, the commission met, pursuant to notice at ten O'Clock A.M. at the office of the undersigned