

PARISH OF ROTHWELL.

Leeds Intelligencer, Saturday 7 June 1845.

On Sunday last, a spacious School-room, at Ingram Place (commonly called Waterloo) in the Parish of Rothwell, was opened for Divine Service the Rev. Henry Dalton, of Whitkirk, having been previously licensed by the Lord Bishop of the Diocese.

The proprietors of the Waterloo Colliery, Messrs. Fenton and Leather, have given every assistance towards providing for the spiritual instruction of the men in their employment, by fitting the School-room in a neat and becoming manner.

The value of Mr. Dalton's services enhanced by their being entirely gratuitous, and we have every reason to believe they will be fully appreciated the pitmen and their families.

We understand that the vicars of Rothwell and Whitkirk will use their best exertions to provide for the more permanent spiritual instruction of this locality—a small Church is already spoken of as likely to be the speedy result this movement; we wish the promoters of every success.

FATAL COALPIT EXPLOSION. TWO LIVES LOST.

Leeds Intelligencer 28 July 1849.

On Monday morning, between six and seven o'clock, an explosion of fire-damp took place in a coal-mine belonging to Messrs. Fenton & Leather, Thorpe Hall, near Leeds, and caused the death of two colliers who were employed in the pit.

The names of the deceased were William Charlesworth and Joseph Keighley. Charlesworth was 55 years of age, and lived at Hunslet; Keighley's age was 56 years, and he lived at the Bank, Leeds.

From the evidence given at the inquest, which was held before Mr. Blackburn, the Leeds borough coroner, on Tuesday, it appeared that the deceased went into the pit called the " Pasture Pit" about a quarter past six o'clock on Monday morning, for the purpose of commencing work.

About 18 men and boys went down at the same time. The deceased did not use their safety lamps. About 20 minutes after they had gone into the pit a loud report was heard, and the alarm being conveyed to the top all

the men and boys in the pit excepting the deceased were drawn up, and were found to have received no injury.

A search was afterwards made for Charlesworth and Keighley, and about half-past ten o'clock they were brought out of the pit dead.

John Sheldon, one of the bottom stewards, accounted for the accident in this way. The deceased, he said, had left a quantity of coals which they had got out on Saturday last lying on a heap, and by so doing had stopped a current of fresh air which flowed through that particular part of the mine. This had caused the inflammable air to accumulate, and on the deceased going to the working with their naked candles an explosion would ensue.

The body of Keighley was discovered lying about 15 yards from the heap of coals, and that of Charlesworth was about 25 yards from the same spot.

It was proved that lamps were provided for all the colliers, and that they had been cautioned against neglecting to use them; also that the two unfortunate sufferers had been threatened with dismissal if they left coals lying in the manner above described.

It was also stated that the pit was exceedingly well ventilated, and that every collier employed in it could have fresh air within four yards of the particular spot at which he was working. The deceased were both experienced miners, Charlesworth having worked about 20 years in the pit and Keighley 25 years. The jury came to the conclusion that the deaths had been caused accidentally.

WATERLOO COLLIERY. LEAVING EMPLOYMENT WITHOUT NOTICE.

Leeds Intelligencer, Saturday 27 March 1858.

William Woodhead, a collier, was brought before three of the West Riding magistrates, (the Rev. J. A. Rhodes, John Gott, Esq., and J. Wilson, Esq.), on Tuesday last, charged with leaving his work without giving notice according to agreement.

The defendant was employed at Messrs. Fenton's Waterloo Colliery, Thorp Stapleton, near Leeds, and owing to a reduction in the rate of wages, Woodhead, and many other colliers, immediately left work on strike.

On being engaged by Messrs. Fenton, the defendant signed a book agreeing to give and take a month's notice in the event of leaving. This he had not done and the colliery proprietors therefore brought him before the magistrates.

A large number of miners attended to hear the case, and much interest was shown in the decision. Mr. Ferns, solicitor, appeared for the complainants; and Mr. C. Naylor, solicitor, attended on behalf of the defendant.

The defence set up was, that Woodhead had left work because he considered the pit dangerous, as several new and inexperienced hands were employed there. The magistrates considered the offence proved, and sent the defendant to Wakefield House of Correction for one month.

TO COALMASTERS & FARMERS. **Yorkshire Gazette, 22 January 1859.**

THE Extensive and Valuable COLLIERY, called Thorpe Hall or Waterloo Colliery, on the Temple Newsam Estate, in the occupation of Kirkby Fenton, Esquire, will be at liberty on 25th March next, by the expiration of the existing Lease.

The FARM, called Thorpe Hall Farm, on the same Estate, consisting of upward of 500 Acres of rich Arable, Meadow, and Pasture LAND, now also in the occupation of the said Kirkby Fenton, will be at liberty on the 2nd February next.

Persons desirous of taking either or both of these concerns may apply to Messrs. ATKINSON, DIBB, and PIPER, Solicitors, Leeds; or to Mr. GEO. LEATHER, Knowsthorp, near Leeds, who will give every Information.

FATAL COLLIERY ACCIDENT NEAR LEEDS.

Leeds Mercury, Tuesday 1 January 1861.

An inquest was held yesterday, at the Town Hall, by Mr. Blackburn, upon John Clarkson, a miner, aged thirty-three years, who lived at Woodlesford, and who was employed at the Pasture Pit, Thorpe Hall colliery, near Leeds, belonging to Mr. Fenton.

The deceased and a man named Calverley, were working together in the pit on the morning of the 29th November last, and, notwithstanding repeated warnings, they neglected to fix sufficient props to support the a roof.

About eight o'clock a portion of the roof, twenty yards broad and twenty yards long, fell and covered them, the rubbish under which they were actually buried weighing about two tons.

The deceased was taken out insensible and removed to the Leeds Infirmary, where he died from the effects of his injuries, on Thursday last. He was dreadfully bruised all over the body, but no bones were broken.

Mr. Morton, the Government Inspector, has made full inquiry into the circumstances, and was satisfied the accident was not attributable to any neglect on the part of Mr. Fenton or his agents, but solely to the carelessness of deceased and Calverley. The jury returned a verdict of "Accidental death."

WATERLOO COLLIERY NEAR LEEDS.

Leeds Mercury, Friday 22 April 1864.

NOTICE is hereby given. that the PARTNERSHIP lately existing between JOHN THOMAS FENTON, CHARLES FENTON. and JOHN WILLIAM CLAY, under the firm of "J. T. Fenton and Co.," as Coal Masters at Leeds, and at Thorp Stapleton, near Leeds, was DISSOLVED by mutual consent, by an agreement under the hands of all the said parties, on the 14th day of Match last, so far as regards the said John William Clay. The businesss will in future be carried on by the said John Thomas Fenton and Charles Fenton. under the firm of "J. T. Fenton and Co."

Dated this 21st day of April, 1864.

J. T. FENTON

CHARLES FENTON.

Hampshire Advertiser. Saturday 23 September 1865.

At Leeds on Tuesday, a colliery proprietor, named Mr. J. T. Fenton, was summoned for having allowed the removal of certain cattle from a herd of 100 beasts, which were upon the Thorpe Hall estate, without the necessary authority of the district inspector, and thus in contravention of the provisions of the Order in Council.

Mr. Fenton was the owner of the herd, and of the Thorpe Hall pastures. The 100 beasts had been in contact with a Dutch bull stricken with the cattle plague, and the inspector ordered the whole herd to be kept where they were. Mr. Fenton's bailiff took upon himself to have twenty of them removed without the necessary authority from the inspector, and so rendered his employer liable to a fine of £20 for each beast so driven off.

Evidence being given that the bailiff had disobeyed both his employer and the inspector in the action he had taken, the summons against Mr. Fenton was, under the circumstances, discharged, the magistrates addressing a severe warning to the bailiff.

LEEDS POLICE COURT YESTERDAY.

Yorkshire Post and Leeds Intelligencer, Friday 12 October 1866.

Phillip May, who some months ago was employed as engineer and managing director to Messrs J. W. Clay & Co., coal merchants, Waterloo Colliery, Thorpe Hall, was apprehended in London Wednesday, by Detective Marshall, of the Leeds police force, and brought in custody, charged with having, at various times, embezzled certain sums of money, the property of his employers, amounting, so far as can be ascertained, to about £46.

The prisoner was empowered to receive monies and settle accounts on behalf of the firm and evidence was given of his having, on one occasion, received the sum of £19 12s. for coals supplied Bray, Waddington, & Co., and on another occasion having received £16 16s. 1d.. from Mr W. Denison.

Receipts were produced in the prisoner's handwriting, but neither of those sums had been accounted for by him. A remand until this day was for, for the production of further evidence.

YORSHIRE SPRING ASSIZES. WEST RIDIING DIVISION. LEEDS TOWN HALL. CROWN COURT.

Yorkshire Post and Leeds Intelligencer, Wednesday 25 Mach 1868.

This was an action to recover the sum of £135 17s. 9d., for goods sold. John William Clay, the plaintiff, the owner of large collieries at Thorpe Stapleton, near Leeds, and the defendant, Wm. Denison, is a brickmaker, carrying business at Leeds. Between June, 1867, and October the same year, large quantities of coal were supplied by the plaintiff to the defendant, the ordinary practice of payment being monthly.

These monthly payments were made from time to time, but eventually a balance was left of £135 17s. 9d., which the defendant would not meet, and Mr Clay had been compelled to take proceedings to obtain his money. The action was undefended, and, after witness had been examined to establish the facts, the jury, by the direction of his Lordship, gave a verdict for the plaintiff for the amount claimed. Mr Middleton and Mr. Ewins Bennett appeared for the plaintiff.

MYSTERIOUS MURDER NEAR LEEDS.

Leeds Mercury, Saturday 5 October 1872.

A shocking discovery has this week been made at Woodlesford, near Leeds, and the particulars, as revealed at the inquest, tend to show that a most brutal murder has been committed by some person or persons at present unknown.

Some time ago, Mr. Issac Fawkner, of Macclesfield, a bachelor fifty years of age, gave up his place of business, and about three weeks ago proceeded to Holbeck, it being then Holbeck Feast, to visit a relation named William Ward, a brick maker.

On Friday, the 20th ult., he went out for a walk, having then about £16 in his pockets, and he was not seen again until Tuesday last. About twenty minutes past five o'clock on the morning that day, as a Woodlesford collier was going along the hauling path of the Aire and Calder Canal to his work, he saw the body of a man floating upright in the water near the Woodlesford colliery.

With the assistance of another man he pulled the body to the side.

A policeman was fetched from Rothwell, and the body, although most frightfully mutilated, was identified as that of Mr. Fawkner.

It was removed to Mr. John Ingham's, the Boot and Shoe Inn, Oulton. Next day an inquest was held on the body before Mr. T. Taylor, of Wakefield.

William, Ward, brick maker, Sodom, Holbeck, was the first witness. He said: The deceased was my first wife's nephew. He was 50 years old and a smallware dealer. He lived in Macclesfield, and was a bachelor. He came to me at Holbeck feast about three weeks ago. He was not a drinker. He complained of pain in his body. He had had a lawsuit, and had given up his place at Macclesfield.

On Friday, the 20th ult., I left him at my house about half-past eight o'clock in the morning. He told me he was going to take a short walk then. When I got home, between five and six o'clock in the afternoon, I found he had gone. I never heard any more of him till about six o'clock yesterday evening, when I saw his dead body at this house. He would have about £16 with him.

Mr. James Nowell, surgeon, Woodlesford, said: I first saw deceased's body at this house this morning. I stripped it and found bruises on the right arm and side, and immediately under the jaw on the right hand side. I am of opinion that they had been inflicted about an hour or an hour and a half before death. There was an incised wound on the left side of the head. It went down to the bone.

There was a smaller wound on the frontal bone, a slight contusion over the left eye, an extensive flesh wound ten inches long, end extending down to the bone on the upper part of the left arm, an incised wound on the left of the axilla, dividing the skin and blood vessels, and under the scalp there was ecchymosis corresponding with the external wound on the left side of the head.

The brain and its membranes were healthy, but free from blood. Immediately under the jaw on the left hand side there was considerable effusion of blood, corresponding with the external bruise.

Ten ribs on the right side and four on the left were fractured in several places, and the right lung was lacerated and normal. In my opinion the cause of death was haemorrhage from the wounds which would be likely to be produced by blows from some sharp instrument. They could not

have been inflicted by deceased on himself. He must have been dead or insensible before he was put in the water.

John Rayner, coal miner, Alma-place, Woodlesford, said: About twenty minutes past five o'clock yesterday morning I was going along the hauling path of the Aire and Calder Canal to my work at Bullough Lane Pit, and when I got near to Woodlesford Colliery I saw deceased's body floating upright in the water. I fetched John Todd from Waterloo, and we pulled the body to the side and then left.

Police constable Ferguson of Rothwell, said: Yesterday morning, about half-past seven o'clock, John Todd came to me, and I went to the canal. Some men helped me to bring the body to this house. The clothes were torn, and the pockets of the trousers were turned inside out. There was mud in the pockets. He was without coat and waist-coat. There was nothing in the pockets.

The Coroner having briefly summed up the evidence, the jury returned a verdict to the effect that the deceased had been murdered by some person or persons unknown.

WATERLOO AND WOODLESFORD COAL COMPANY (LIMITED).

Yorkshire Post and Leeds Intelligencer, Tuesday 9 December 1873.

Yesterday an action was heard in the Leeds County Court before Mr V. Thompson, deputy judge, in which William Allison, seedsman and florist, Kirkgate Market, Leeds, sued the Waterloo and Woodlesford Coal Company (Limited), Temple Newsam, to recover the sum of £39 4s. 2d., damages sustained through injuries to a filly belonging to plaintiff, by the negligence the defendants, and expenses occasioned such injury.

It appeared that in May last the plaintiff, by an agreement with Mr Middleton, who rents the Thorpe Hall Pastures, placed out at agistment in those pastures a valuable black filly. Through the particular field in which the filly, with others, was placed a tramway ran from one the defendants' collieries to the canal.

Where the tramway passes out of the field is a gate, which, for the protection of stock in the field, ought to be kept closed; but owing, it was alleged, to this gate being left open, the filly got out of the field, and wandered into the canal.

She was found at two o'clock in the morning swimming in the canal. Apparently the animal had been in the water some hours. She was got out, but had sustained such injury that her value was very considerably reduced.

Mr Pullan, for plaintiff, explained that he should have advised his client to sue Middleton, but for the fact that defendants had taken the responsibility upon themselves. They agreed with the plaintiff to refer the question of damages to arbitration, the result of which was that on the 11th of October defendants were to have the option of taking the animal, if plaintiff was not satisfied with her, on paying plaintiff £40; and in the event of them refusing this, plaintiff was to sell the animal by auction, and if she brought a sum short of £40, defendants were to pay the difference.

When the time came for the carrying out of the award defendants took no steps, and thereupon plaintiff took the animal and sold her by auction, realising £12.

It was contended, on behalf of plaintiff, that the defendants were bound, according to the terms which they held their rights, to keep the gates to the tramway in repair, and to keep them closed when they were not being used.

Mr Granger, for the defence, objected that plaintiff had no right of action against the defendants, in as much as his contract for the agistment of the filly was with Mr Middleton, and not with the defendants. This objection, however, was overruled by the judge.

It was further urged for the defence that the duty of keeping this gate closed devolved on Mr Middleton, and in support of this Mr Hall, the company's manager, gave evidence to the effect that the company possess a cottage near the gate, and that some time ago Mr Middleton was allowed to put a man in his employment into this cottage, on condition that this person looked after the gate.

Another point urged for the defendants was that the animal in October was in much better condition than was alleged by the plaintiff, and that but for plaintiff's injudicious conduct in selling her at the time she sold she would have brought a greater sum money than had realised.

With regard to the award if was alleged that the arbitrators had to see the animal after the 11th October if the company declined take her, to judge in what condition she was, but that this was prevented by plaintiff taking her away and selling her. Verdict for the plaintiff, for £34 and costs.

SERIOUS CHARGE AGAINST THE WOODLESFORD COAL COMPANY, LIMITED.

ALLEGED EXTENSIVE FRAUD UPON MINERS.

Sheffield Daily Telegraph, Saturday 7 March 1874.

Yesterday, at the West Riding Police Court, Wakefield, the Woodlesford Coal Company, Limited, were charged by Mr. Superintendent Hall, Deputy Chief Constable for the West Riding, and Inspector of Weights and Measures for the Lower Petty Sessional Division, with having in their possession an unjust coal weighing machine.

The magistrates on the Bench were J. C. D. Charlesworth, Esq. (Chairman), D. B. Kendell, Esq., and Major Barker. The defendants were represented by Mr. Quiggin (from the Office of Messrs. Fernandes and Gill), and Mr. Matthew Stokoe Hall, their manager, appeared in answer to the summons.

The case, which was one of some interest to miners, was the first of the kind brought under the notice of this Court, and it was clearly proved by Mr. Hall. He said that on the 21st of last month he visited the Company's colliery, and found upon the pit hill a weighing machine which was used for weighing the coal as the corves came out upon the bank.

On testing the machine with the imperial standards he found that when he put on a 56lb weight it took 28lbs to balance it. He further tested it with four 56lb. weights, and it absolutely took another 56lb. weight to balance it.

Mr. Hall added that it was certainly the worst machine he ever tested, and he could scarcely conceive that there was such a bad machine within his jurisdiction as inspector of weights and measures.

The machine seemed to have been in a bad state for some time past, and the miners engaged in the pit must have sacrificed their earnings to a very considerable extent, because every corve of coal they filled would be 56lbs. wrong against them. The defendants were fined £5 and costs, altogether £5 12s. 6d.

This appeared to have been going on for some time, and was a great injustice to the men, as it was by the machine in question that their corves of coal were weighed.

For the defence, Mr. Quoggin contended that no offence had been committed within the meaning of the act of Parliament, as the coals weighed at the machine were not sold to the public.

The Bench, however, held that an offence within the meaning of the act had been committed, and said they wanted to know the why and the wherefore of the machine being wrong.

Mr. Quoggin said he was instructed to state that the company were not aware that the machine was wrong, and there had been no intention to wrong any one. When its faulty condition was discovered it was at once sent away to be rectified; and there was only a difference of lib between the general average of the corves before and after the machine being put right. The Bench held that the mistake ought to have been rectified before, and they inflicted the full penalty of £5, and 12s. 6d. expenses.

NEWSOME v. MIDLAND RAILWAY COMPANY. PERSONAL INJURIES. (Special Jury.)

Bradford Observer, 7 August 1875.

Mr. Seymour, Q.C. and Mr. H. Shield were for the plaintiff and Mr. Wills, Q.C, and Mr. P. Thompson were for the defendants.

The plaintiff, Joe Newsome, was a plumber and painter, twenty-five years of age, a married man with a wife and one child, and lived at Woodlesford.

He was employed by the Waterloo and Woodlesford Colliery Company to paint certain railway waggons belonging to them, and which were on the Midland Railway. For the convenience of the railway company the colliery company made an application that some of these waggons should be taken to the Hunslet siding, and accordingly on the 29th January last, permission to put the waggons at Hunslet having been obtained from a bookkeeper in the railway office, some twenty or thirty waggons were removed to that place.

They were at first placed in what was called the ballast siding, and there the plaintiff and another man named Craven commenced work on them. After a day or two the foreman shunter came to plaintiff and said that they wanted to clear out the siding, and he would have to take out the waggons. This was done, and sixteen of them were then put in a siding, No. 9, on the other side of the line.

There the plaintiff and Craven continued their work on the waggons. On the 26th of February, about a quarter to two o'clock, the accident occurred which was the foundation of the present action. Craven was on the outside of the waggons painting, while the plaintiff was between two of the waggons painting the buffers.

While he was in this position, without receiving any notice or warning whatever, the waggons were violently pushed together, and plaintiff's arm was caught between the buffers of two waggons and fearfully crushed and broken.

Plaintiff was held as in a vice, and dragged about twenty yards along the line before the waggons were brought to a stand. On being released the plaintiff was carried to the Leeds Infirmary, where it was found that the injuries to the arms were of such a dreadful character that the limb had to be amputated.

It was the right arm, and of course the plaintiff had been prevented from working at his trade. The defendant pleaded that the plaintiff was in the siding unlawfully, and without the permission of the company, and that therefore they were not responsible for the accident. A further plea was that plaintiff was there at his own risk, and that he was responsible for the accident by his own negligence.

Evidence for plaintiff showed that the colliery company had applied for and received permission in writing to have their wagons painted at the Hunslet siding, and after Mr. Wills had contested for some time the authority of the person granting the permission to pledge the company, he withdrew that portion of the defence, and proceeded with the plea of contributory negligence.

Evidence was called that when the wagons were removed to No. 9 siding plaintiff and Craven were warned that shunting was going on constantly, and that it would take one of them most of his time to look out. Plaintiff on being told this said one of them would have to keep a look out.

Council on both sides having addressed the jury, and his lordship having summed up, the jury, after a short consideration, returned a verdict for plaintiff, damages £300.

CHARGE AGAINST A WOODLESFORD MINER.

Leeds Mercury, Tuesday 15 February 1876.

Yesterday, at the Wakefield Court-house, before Mr. D. B. Kendall and Colonel Mackie, George Bottom, a miner, in the employ of the Waterloo and Woodlesford Colliery Company Limited, was charged with infringing the 40th special rule in force at the colliery. Mr. Hall, of firm of Messrs. Gill and Hall, appeared to prosecute.

It seemed that last Thursday, a shot firer named Holt, attempted to fire a shot in a place where the defendant and another man named Forshaw were employed. The shot missed fire and the defendant was distinctly told three times that he must not drill the shot out, and he was removed to another place in the workings.

Notwithstanding this the defendant was subsequently found drilling out the shot and his companion was holding a lamp for him. Forshaw told the defendant that they would be "in for it" and Bottom replied that they could finish the work in 10 minutes. Before they completed it one of the officials came up and finding them drilling out the shot he pushed them out of the workings.

Mr. Andrews, the certified manager at the collieries said this was a most dangerous practice, and as it had become very common he was directed by the company to press this case. The defendant said that he had nothing to do with drilling out the shot. The Bench ordered the defendant to pay a fine and expenses amounting to £3 0 shillings 4d., or in default six weeks imprisonment.

FATAL COLLIERY ACCIDENT NEAR LEEDS.

Leeds Mercury, Tuesday 18 December 1877.

Yesterday an inquest was held at the Leeds Town Hall, before Mr. Malcolm, touching the death of John Nevitt (33), miner, Woodlesford. The deceased was employed at Messrs. Clay and Co.'s Waterloo Colliery, Woodlesford, and on Friday afternoon was walking along one of the

"roads" with two fellow workmen, when a piece of rock, weighing 15 cwts., fell upon him from the roof.

Some of his ribs were broken, and other internal injuries were inflicted. He was removed to the General Infirmary, where he died the same evening. It was stated by one of the deputies, named Ellis, whose duty it was to inspect the colliery, that the roof in question was quite safe at twelve o'clock at noon on Friday, and there was not the slightest indication that any portion of it would fall,

Mr. White, the manager, stated that the roofs were examined every 'shift.' Sometimes the change of weather affected the stone, and pieces broke off without warning. The Coroner said he had received a letter from Mr. Wardell, Government Inspector, who had examined the colliery, said he was of opinion that the circumstances in which had led to the man's death were purely accidental. The jury returned a verdict of "Accidental death."

TRADE DISPUTES AMONG MINERS IN THE LEEDS DISTRICT.

Leeds Times, Saturday 11 May 1878.

It is now rather more than a fortnight since the men and boys at the two pits belonging to the Waterloo and Woodlesford Colliery Company struck work in consequence of a 5 per cent, reduction of their wages, and certain alterations in reference to the remuneration for getting coal and packing.

The men resisted the reduction of wages, refusing to be ruled by the representatives of the Miners' Association, with which they had no connection, and accordingly they turned out. This reduction is, however, not the only thing about which they complain. Formerly the men were paid a certain price for getting coal, but the masters allege that under that system the men neglected to do the packing, and, as a result of their neglect, the roof fell in in many places, and a loss was entailed on the proprietors.

In order, therefore, to ensure this necessary work being performed, the prices were re-arranged, and the consequence has been that the packing has been better attended to ever since. The men, however, complain that these altered prices are equal to a reduction of their wages to the extent of about 20 per cent.

They say that whereas they used to be paid 1s 7 3/4d. a ton for getting coal, this price has been reduced to 1s 5 3/4d., or a reduction of 2d. per ton; and that whereas they formerly received 9s. 9d. per yard for packing, the price has been reduced to 4s. 2d., or a reduction of 5s. 7d. per yard. These are the old grievances. about which they have begun to complain in strong terms since notice was given of the 5 per cent. reduction.

The disputes which have resulted in the stoppage of the five pits at or near to Allerton Bywater, owned by Messrs. Bower and Co., and in nearly 800 men and boys being thrown out of employment, still remain unsettled.

For some time past the men at two or three pits of the Messrs. Bower have complained that their interests have been injured by the accumulation of slack for which their employers could not find ready sale. The masters, partly as an experiment, offered to introduce riddles into two pits, and asked the miners to use them before sending up the coal.

Fourteen days' notice of the employers' intention to put in the riddles was duly given, but before it had expired the men intimated that they would not work with riddles upon any terms, as the additional labour involved would be very considerable. The firm thereupon declared that the only alternative they could allow was a reduction of wages to the extent of 12 1/2 per cent., and of this they gave the men employed at the Albert and Fleakingley Beck pits (from whence the original complaint had come) fourteen days' notice. Prior to this step being taken another source of disagreement had arisen at the Victoria Colliery.

Messrs. Bower, finding it impossible to sell all the output at remunerative prices, informed the men at the last-named pit that unless they would concede a reduction of 2d. per ton for getting they would be compelled to temporarily close the colliery. The men refused to listen to these terms, and at the expiration of a fortnight's notice they took away their tools. When the miners had been idle for a week they returned to the masters and offered to resume work on the terms proposed.

But they were then told that during the week they had been away the firm had lost opportunities of increasing their trade ; and that the masters were not then in a position to re-open the colliery. On the same day upon which the masters gave the notice of a 12 1/2 per cent. reduction to the miners at the Albert and Fleakingley Beck pits, the men employed at the West

Allerton and Preston pits sent in a fortnight's notice of a demand for an advance of 12 1/2 per cent.

The masters regarded this step as a manoeuvre, and accordingly on the day the men's demand for an advance was handed to them, they served each man who sought the increase with a fortnight's notice to leave.

The result was that as the miners at the Albert and Fleackingley Beck pits would neither admit the riddles nor accept the reduction of 12 1/2 per cent., and as the hands employed at the other two pits would not withdraw their demand for an advance, the whole of the men left work on the day upon which the notices simultaneously terminated, and since then the collieries have been almost entirely closed.

It should be added that the men complain of hardship in connection with the closing of the Victoria Colliery, and aver that the introduction of riddles, with the alternative of a reduction of 12 1/2 per cent., is not warranted by the condition of the coal trade or by the reduced wages being now paid at other West Yorkshire collieries.

SHOCKING ACCIDENT AT A WOODLESFORD COLLIERY.

Yorkshire Post and Leeds Intelligencer, Tuesday 12 November 1878.

A coroner's inquiry into the cause the death of Solomon Butterworth and Robert Inman, miners, employed at the Beeston Side Pit of the Waterloo and Woodlesford Colliery Company, and who were killed by being precipitated down the shaft of the pit last Friday, was held the Old Red Lion Inn, Thwaite Gate, yesterday.

Mr. F. N. Wardell, Government Inspector of Mines, was present. Mr Ferns appeared for the relatives of Inman, and the Colliery Company were represented Mr Hall, of Wakefield.

William Jennings, hanger-on at the Beeston shaft, said he was on duty at mid-day last Friday, and saw the cage come down. He rang three on the rod to intimate that two men were about to ascend, and received back the signal of two raps on the rod, meaning that they were ready.

He then gave the signal that the cage with the two men in was ready to come up, and immediately afterwards the cage commenced to ascend the shaft with Butterworth and Inman in it. Shortly afterwards he heard a noise,

and saw the cage come to the bottom again with the men in. They were both quite dead.

Mr. Ferns: The signal he sent up should have reached the banksman and the signalman at the same time, and the reply he received would be from the banksman.

By Mr. Hall: He had he been employed in the colliery 40 years and had been hanger-on for 26 years. He acted as usual on the occasion in question when the men were ascending.

John Leeson, the banksman, after being cautioned by the coroner, said he was acting for the head banksman, who was away last Friday. He received from the hanger-on and returned the usual signals when Butterworth and Inman were about to ascend. It was his duty to have remained at the mouth of the pit all the time the men were ascending, to be ready to receive them at the top or to report any mishap to the engineman, but instead of doing so he went away about five yards to hang up some tickets.

The shaft was 200 yards deep, and the cage usually ascended in about half a minute. It was his duty, had he been in his proper place, to have, by pulling a lever, thrown a "fall," some iron bars upon which the cage rested after having been drawn up, across the mouth of the pit.

As he was turning round to return, after hanging up his tickets, he saw the cage go up to the head gear, turn round, and it and the deceased go down the shaft. It was then too late for him to do anything to prevent the accident. He had occasionally taken the banksman's work previously, and he had been employed on the bank pulling out the corves 3 1/2 years.

By Mr. Wardell: He had seen a copy of the rules which he had broken posted on the bank. He had been in the habit, even when men were ascending, to leave the pit mouth to hang up tickets, and no one had complained, though he did not think the manager had ever seen him do it.

The cage must have come up at full speed on Friday, and he had no idea it was so near the top when he left his post to hang up the tickets. He thought by the sound that the cage came faster than ordinary. He did not notice the speed till the cage was nearing the top, or he might have taken some precaution. He could not see the engineman, but could at any time shout to him if anything went wrong.

By Mr. Ferns: If I had stuck to the pit bank I might possibly have prevented this accident, though that would have depended on whether the four bars which I should have placed across the mouth of the shaft would have been strong enough to have held the cage when it fell down from the head gear.

The Coroner read a copy of one of the rules placed on the pit bank, and which required the banksman to stand at the pit mouth and listen whilst men were ascending, and to signal the engineman to stop in case of alarm or accident.

By the Coroner: He was a labourer at the colliery several years before going to the bank.

By Mr. Hall: In the ordinary course of things the cage should stop immediately it reaches a point a few feet above the mouth of the shaft, but on the occasion in question it was wound higher than usual. Had he been there to place the “falls” across the shaft when the cage had passed, it might have broken through them in its descent. The cage would weigh about a ton.

Joseph Jackson, the engineman, having been cautioned, voluntarily stated that, although he should have received from the bottom of the shaft a signal of three raps to indicate that men were about to ascend, he only knew of the fact by hearing the signal given to the banksman and by the working of the drum. The wire to which the signalling bell was attached was slack and had worked irregularly all the fortnight he had worked the colliery. He had called the attention of his mate to the condition of the signalling wire, but had not said anything to the engine-wright.

The Coroner read one of the company’s rules requiring the engineman to examine his engine twice or three times a day, and to inform the underground viewer or the engine-wright of any defect.

Witness said had never complained to anyone but his mate. When the signal of two raps on the rod was being sent from the bottom, one hit and one missed in the engine-house. He then knew the men were coming up. The engine-room was too far away from the shaft for him to see where the cage was it was ascending. He shut off steam, as usual, when, by the indicator, the cage was half way up the shaft, and applied the reversing lever to place the steam against the engine.

The Coroner: Then how do you account for the cage being overwound into the head gearing? One of the valves of the engine stuck, and instead of the steam being against the engine I could hear it going out of the exhaust pipe. He had heard of valves and had known that particular valve stick before.

By Mr. Wardell: The signalling indicator was out of order, but he had neglected to complain to the proper authorities. It had been out of order before he went to the colliery. The manager very seldom went into the engine-house, and he could not say whether he had ever been there at a time when it failed in working. He had been at the Beeston Side Colliery about five months, and before that had been in the employment of the Lowmoor Company and at Messrs. Pope & Pearson's Stanley Main Colliery.

He had never pulleyed any men before, though he had for 22 or 23 years worked at collieries. He had never pulleyed a cage. He was the engineman at the Glass Houghton Colliery when two men were killed in the sump.

Was your name Jackson when you were engineman there? No, Johnson. Then have changed your name since then? Yes.

Why? Because my proper name is Jackson.

You were in charge of the engines at Glass Houghton Colliery when two men were killed, were you not? I was.

In reply to further questions by Mr. Wardell, witness said the valve which stuck had been packed about a week back with patent packing, and it was tightened down to keep from blowing off last Wednesday. He himself touched it with a screwkey on that day. Break valves would often stick with the priming of the boilers. The break was on the lower side, and was a foot-break, and he did not think it was of sufficient power, as it would not hold the cage. A week before the accident he had told the engine-wright that it would not hold the engines, and he said nothing in reply.

He had never known that particular valve stick before. He had pulled the men out with the engine since, and it had not stuck. At the time of the accident he was drawing the cage up at the ordinary speed. He held the break with his foot, but it was not powerful enough to stop the cage. He was watching the indicator and the marks on the drum at the time.

Did you look towards the shaft when you found the engine was getting the master of you ? No, we have not to look at the top.
But this was an extraordinary case? I tried what I could do with the foot break, and I kept it applied until the accident occurred. I could not see the cage go up, but after it got to the top it dropped on the side of the head-gear. The engines were going slow.

Mr. Ferns: Were you indicted for manslaughter in the case where two men were killed Glass Houghton Colliery? I was.

And you were convicted, I believe? Yes.

And you had only been employed at this colliery fourteen days? Yes.

In reply to further questions put by Mr Ferns, witness said that his attention had not been called to the imperfection of one of the ropes, though he heard that one of them was deficient. It was condemned for winding men with by the steward, Mr. Waterhouse. Did you not afterwards draw out 180 men with the same rope? Yes.

Mr Hall: I say this is not material, as the rope was only used after the accident when the other rope was not available.

Did you change you name from Johnson to Jackson, on account of the conviction you have named? No; my name was Jackson when I worked for the Lowmoor Iron Company.

Were you convicted in the name of Jackson ? Yes.

Did not Mr Golightly complain to you about the way in which you were doing your work ? No, never.

But he refused to certify that you were a proper person to set on as engineman, did he not? Yes.

Witness, continuing, said that immediately after the accident Mr. Waterhouse asked him if could lower him and another gentleman and pull them up again. He replied "Yes," and he then lowered and drew the cage, and the valve did not stick. He believed that the sticking of the valve was the cause of the accident. He afterwards found that the valve was almost completely furred up. The engine had been running for five years without an examination of the valve.

Mr. Hall : That you know nothing about.

Witness: These valves should be examined every six or eight months.

By a Juryman: The valves had to that point worked all.

Another Juryman: Is there not a man playing now having been lamed by your over-winding him? No, there isn't.

The Juryman: I know there is.

Edward Rose, surgeon, Hunslet, described the appearance of the bodies of the deceased, and said the men's skulls were fractured, that one of them was beyond identification, and that all their bones were smashed.

Isaac W.H. White said he had been certified manager of the pit since the beginning of 1876. The engineman and the banksmen were under his superintendence. He walked through the engine-house at times, and it was the duty of the enginemen to report to the enginewright anything which was defective, and the enginewright should report to witness as to the state of the engine.

He had never received any complaint about the none working of the signals. The banksman was under the control of the underviewer in his absence. He was away when the accident occurred, and when he examined the indicator connected with signalling he found it rather faulty, but he had not ascertained the cause, though the reason why the vibrating plate was not struck was that the wire was slack. From what he saw of the engineman the first day they employed him he thought he would be fully equal to his work. He had heard for the first time that day that Jackson had previously been convicted for manslaughter.

By Mr. Wardell: The wire could be tightened any time in a few minutes. Walker's patent detaching hook was affixed to the cage, and although the cage was overdrawn the result would have been alright but for the bad working of the catch. Walker's safety hook had worked very satisfactorily several times in the case of over-winding at their collieries. Part of the apparatus was a cast-iron ring at the top of the shaft, a portion of which had been carried away by the accident. There was a piece out of the catch apparatus, and it had not worked properly. The eye or ring at the top of the shaft was of cast-iron, and instead of giving way, it should have held the cage and allowed the upper portion of the catch to go free, preventing serious consequences.

He attributed the accident to the sticking of the valve. Most valves would stick at times. Fur would have the effect of stopping up the valve, but he could not say how long it would take to accumulate fur enough to stop the valve from working freely.

By the Jury: The falls, had they been put across the shaft in time by the banksman, might have stopped the cage, but the immediate cause of the accident was the over-winding. He had seen Walker's patent hook fail before.

John Kirby, engineer, Wakefield Road, Leeds, said he had, by the instructions of the coroner, examined all the machinery connected with winding at the Beeston Side Pit. He considered the engines to be all right, but considered the position of the engine-man might be improved.

The safety clip seemed to be all right, but the eye or support which should have held up the cage had failed, and he thought the cast-iron supports should be replaced by steel, wrought iron, or best malleable iron ones.

The apparatus for supporting the cage should be made self-acting in one direction, so that as soon as the cage arrived at the landing stage the apparatus would fall into such a position that it would be impossible to fall down the shaft until liberated by someone in charge.

He did not think the sticking of the valve in question should have prevented the man from stopping the engine. The noise of steam escaping through the exhaust-pipe would draw the engineman's attention from the indicator, and thus he would be ignorant of the position of the cage. The inquest was then adjourned till Friday.

THE FATAL OVERWINDING ACCIDENT AT A WOODLESFORD COLLIERY.

Yorkshire Post and Leeds Intelligencer, Saturday 16 November, 1878.

The inquiry into the circumstances connected with the accident by which Solomon Butterworth and Robert Inman were precipitated down the Beeston Side shaft of the Waterloo and Woodlesford Collieries yesterday week was resumed before the Leeds coroner (Mr Malcolm) at the Old Red Lion Hotel, Thwaite Gate, yesterday.

Mr F. N. Wardell again attended; Mr Ferns appeared for the relatives of Inman, and Mr Hall (Messrs Gill & Hall, Wakefield) for the Colliery Company.

Charles Waterhouse, steward and under viewer at the colliery, said the tickets came up with the cages, and it was the duty of the banksman to hang them up on a rack four yards from the pit top. He had never found any banksman absent from his post when he ought to be putting the rests in. He had never known the patent clip of Walker's to fail, though only a fortnight before the accident the cage was wound up too high through the fault of Waterhouse, the second engineman.

By Mr. Wardell: He had seen Walker's patent detaching hook partially fail before. The engine-wright was on duty as such for the first time on the day of the accident. He had been many years at the colliery, but was not a mechanic, and had never been in mechanic's shop. Mr White, the manager, appointed him.

By Mr Ferns: Walter's detaching hooks were made in various sizes. Large ones might bear a strain of 30 tons, but theirs was not large one. When he saw the hook fail the cage had hit the gearing before it came down.

The engine-wright or engineman never made a report to him. Witness examined the signalling wire after the accident and found it all right. The bell of the indicator did not ring well, but the engineman could hear the stroke. The ring had been in use five years.

It was untrue that the signalling bell was so slack that it would not ring. Whether the rests, if put in, would have stopped the cage depended entirely on the force of the rebound with which it returned from the head gearing.

Mr. Clegg (Sheffield) here intimated that he had been instructed to appear for the relatives of Inman, but the Coroner said he could not allow two cross-examinations on behalf of one party, and Mr Ferns appeared for the friends of Inman. Mr. Clegg said he had also been instructed to appear for the West Yorkshire Miners' Association, out of whose funds the widows would have to be relieved.

The Coroner: That association cannot be represented here.

Clegg: Sometimes the association is allowed to be present, and to put questions.

The Coroner: It is too remote.

Henry Golightly, engine-wright at the colliery from December, 1876, to the Wednesday prior to the accident, deposed that he had never known Walker's hook fail any way. Two days before the accident the signals and indicator worked properly. The valve had not been out for examination for a year. This one was packed a few days before the accident.

By Mr. Ferns: He thought Jackson was a good engineman, and he had not refused to certify him. Jackson complained to him that the brake did not work properly, and it was altered. The indicator bell was cracked a little, but the indicator was enough for the engineman. Walker's hook might be

improved by something which would keep the clamps open when they had once passed through the eye of the shaft. In reply to Mr Clegg (who said he was retained by Butterworth's friends), witness said that a short time ago the men played a day, alleging as the reason that Waterhouse was not a competent engineman, He never heard them object to Jackson.

John Crossland said he commenced his duties as engine-wright at the colliery the day before the accident. He made an outward examination of the machinery on starting. The signalling wire was slack, and the bell was cracked. He had been foreman labourer before being appointed engine-wright, and the only training he had received as a mechanic was by helping the mechanics. He had hardly got a-going when found these defects.

Mr. Wardell. : Have you any knowledge of engines all? No; only by helping the mechanics.

When did you get a copy of the rules? After the accident.

Did you not think you would have additional responsibilities as engineman? Did you never read the rules about your duties, or any rules all? I had read them partly, I passed them on the bank.

Had you heard any complaint from the engineman? I heard Jackson say, "I don't know what the f... is amiss with yond banksman. I've had to bend up for him twice this morning."

What did you understand by that? That the engineman had had to raise the cage twice for the banksman to see whether the cage was safe, when the latter should have looked before.

Mr. Ferns: Then, though you undertook the duties of engine-wright you know nothing about engines? I could not work this engine, though I've worked the water engine and the capstan.

By Mr. Clegg: I have been 28 years at the colliery, but have never had or read the rules. I helped mechanics before being engine-wright.

By Mr. Hall: I have assisted to put engines together many a time, and got my knowledge from observation.

John Leeson, banksman, recalled, said he remembered many times when the cage had come down upon rests so sharply as to push the rests out.

The Coroner: How long ago? That is very important. I don't remember; but it has happened several times.

Has it happened in the time of this engineman?

A Juryman: Yes sir.

The Coroner: I am questioning the witness.

A Juryman: When the rests were knocked out as you describe, would the cage have gone to the bottom had the rope been detached? It would.

Joseph Jackson, engineman, recalled, said that on morning of the accident he had had to bend up a dozen times, as the banksman was neglectful. Mr Golightly engaged him without a character.

Mr .White, certified manager the colliery, recalled, said that Crossland assisted in the erection of all the engines about the colliery. He was one of their oldest and most valuable, sober, and trustworthy men about the place. He knew when he appointed him engine-wright that, though not scientific, he was a practical man. Before appointing Jackson engineman he watched him handle the engines in such a way as convinced him that he could do the work.

The jury returned a verdict to the effect that the deceased had been accidentally killed. They considered that there had been neglect on the part of the engineman and banksman in not carrying out the rules, and that the manager of the pit had not seen the rules properly carried out.

They also recommended the adoption of self-acting rests, and were satisfied that if there had been a wrought or malleable, instead of a cast-iron ring at the mouth of the shaft, the accident not have occurred, and that if the rests had been properly attended to the accident might have been prevented.

THE FATAL ACCIDENT AT A COLLIERY.

Leeds Mercury, Tuesday 12 November 1878.

Yesterday an inquest was held before Mr. Malcolm, at the Old Red Lion Inn, Thwaite Gate, Hunslet, on the bodies of Solomon Butterworth (29), miner, and Bob Inman (30), miner, who met with their deaths at the Waterloo and Woodlesford Collieries on Friday last. Mr. Hall, solicitor, Wakefield, watched the case on behalf of the Waterloo and Woodlesford Colliery Company Limited; and Mr. Ferns, solicitor, watched the case on behalf of the relatives of Inman. Mr. Wardell, Government Inspector, was also present at the inquiry.

William Jennings, a "hanger-on" at the Beeston shaft of the Railwayside Pit, Waterloo and Woodlesford Collieries, stated that he was "hanging on"

on Friday last between twelve and one o'clock. He saw the deceased men get into the cage, and gave the signal for it to ascend. The cage went up, and witness stepped aside.

Shortly afterwards the cage fell back again. He saw a substance a like a black cloud pass him, but he could not make out at the time what it was. On the cage being examined Inman and Butterworth were found in it quite dead.

John Leeson, banksman, stated, after being cautioned, that he received a signal from the "hanger on" on the day in question that men wanted to come out of the pit. He answered for them to get into the cage, and then received the signal that they were ready to come up. His duty on receiving the last signal was to remain at the pit mouth.

After receiving the last signal on Friday, he went to hang up some tickets about five yards distance a from the pit mouth. His duty was to remain at the pit mouth until the cage came up. As soon as the cage appeared at the pit mouth, it was his duty to put the "rests" down. This was done by pulling a lever and throwing a projection over the pit mouth. When the 1 cage came up he was just turning from the tickets to go to the pit mouth again. He heard a noise, and in turning around saw the cage falling back again. He could not see the engineman from the pit mouth. The engineman had a signal in the engine-house.

Witness had to give no a signal to anybody when the cage came up. His only duty was to thrust out the "rests" for the cage to rest upon. Witness was not the bead banksman, but he was in charge on the day in question. He had occasionally been in charge before. A man was employed over him, but when as he was not there witness acted as first banksman. When the head man there, witness assisted to hold the a corves on the bank

Joseph Jackson, engineman at the pit, was also cautioned before giving his evidence. He stated that he did not receive the first signal in his engine-house, because the wire connected with the bell was slack, and did not answer. He heard the bell, however, at the pit top. The bell in the engine-house had worked irregularly ever since he had been employed there, and that was a fortnight. He had mentioned to his mate, Sidney Waterhouse, that the bell did not rap properly.

By Mr. Wardell. You say that the indicator is out of order? Well, it is not right. It does not rap the bell.

And you say you have never complained to the proper authorities about it. No, I believe not.

Where were you before going to that pit? I worked for the Low Moor Company for five months, and before that I was at Stanley Main Pit.

Have you ever "pulled" any men before? Never.

How long have you been an engineman? Twenty-two or twenty-three years

Have you ever had any men killed in the shaft, in any way at all, is when you have been in charge of the engines? No.

Were you the engineman at Glass Houghton Pit when men were killed in the shaft? They were not killed in the pit then; they were in the sump

But that is at the a bottom of the shaft? Yes.

Was your name Jackson when you were engineman at Glass Houghton?

No; it was Johnson.

How is that? Because my proper name is Johnson.

Then, you have changed it to Jackson. Yes.

Did you look towards the shaft when you found the engine was getting the master of you ? No, we have not to look at the top.

But this was an extraordinary case. I tried what I could do with the footbrake, and I kept it applied until the accident occurred. I could not see the cage go up, but after it got to the top it dropped on the side of the be headgear. The engines were going slow.

Mr. Ferns. Were you indicted for manslaughter in the case where two men were killed at Glass Houghton Colliery ? I was.

And you were convicted, I believe. Yes.

And you had only been employed at this colliery fourteen days. Yes.

In reply to further questions put by Mr. Ferns witness said that his attention had not been called to the imperfection of one of the ropes, though he heard that one of them was deficient. It was condemned for winding men with by the steward, Mr. Waterhouse.

Did you not afterwards draw out 180 men with the same rope? Yes.

Were you convicted in the name of Jackson ? Yes.

Witness, continuing, said that immediately after the accident Mr. Waterhouse asked him if he could lower him and another gentlemen and pull them up again. He replied "Yes," and he then lowered and drew up the cage, and the valve did not stick.

He believed that the sticking of the valve was the cause of the accident. He afterwards found that the valve was almost completely furred up. The engine had been running for five years without an examination of the valve.

Edward Rose, surgeon, Hunslet, described the appearance of the bodies of the deceased, and said the men's skulls were fractured, that one of them was beyond identification, and that all their bones were smashed.

Isaac W. H. White said he had been certified manager of the pit since the beginning of 1876. The enginemen and the banksmen were under his superintendence. He walked through the engine-house at times, and it was the duty of the enginemen to report to the engine wright anything which was defective, and the engine wright should report to witness as to the state of the engine.

He had never received any complaint about the non-working of the signals. The banksman was under the control of the underviewer in his absence. He was away when the accident occurred, and when he examined the indicator connected with signalling he found it rather faulty. He had not ascertained the cause, though the reason why the vibrating plate was not struck was that the wire was slack.

From what he saw of the engineman on the first day they employed him he thought he would be fully equal to his work. He had heard for the first time that day that Jackson had been previously convicted for manslaughter.

John Kirby, engineer, Wakefield Road, Leeds, said he had, by the instructions of the Coroner, examined all the machinery connected with the winding at the Beeston Side Pit. He considered the engines to be all right, but r considered that the position of the enginemen might be improved.

The safety clip seemed to be all right, but the eye, or support, which should have held up the cage had failed, and he thought the cast-iron supports should be replaced by steel, wrought iron, or best malleable iron ones.

The apparatus for supporting the cage should be made self-acting In one direction, so that as soon as the a cage arrived at the landing-stage the apparatus would fall into such a position that it would be impossible to fall down the shaft until liberated by some one in charge. He did not think the sticking of the valve in question should have prevented the man stopping the engine. The noise of steam escaping through the exhaust-pipe would draw the engineman's attention from the indicator, and thus he would be ignorant of the position of the cage. The inquest was then adjourned till Friday.

THE FATAL ACCIDENT AT A COLLIERY NEAR LEEDS.

Leeds Mercury, Saturday 16 November 1878.

The adjourned inquiry into the cause of the death of Solomon Butterworth and Bob Inman, miners, employed, at the Beeston Side Pit of the Waterloo and Woodlesford Colliery Company, and who were killed by being precipitated down the shaft of the pit last Friday, was held at the Old Red Lion Inn, Thwaite Gate, Hunslet, yesterday before Mr. Malcolm.

Mr. F. N. Wardell, Government Inspector of Mines, was present at the inquiry. Mr. Ferns appeared for the relatives of Inman, Mr. Clegg, Jun. of Sheffield, for the relatives of Butterworth and the Colliery Company were represented by Mr. Hall, of Wakefield.

Charles Waterhouse, steward and working manager at the pit in question, stated that he was at work at the time of the accident in the office on the surface. Whilst there he received a communication, in consequence of which he went to the pit top. He saw the witness Leeson, and asked him if he had put the rests down to hold the cage.

He replied that he had not, and that he was hanging some tickets when the cage came up. He had never found any of the men neglecting their duty before. The patent "clip" had been in use at the pit for five years, and he had never known it fail to act properly before.

The cage had several times been wound up too high. A fortnight before the accident he saw it wound up too high twice. He made inquiry as to how this arose, but found that it was not caused by any default in the machinery. After the accident, Jackson, the engineman, told him that one of the valves of his engine was blocked up.

By Mr. Wardell. He had known a similar apparatus to the one now used for winding up the cage partially fail before. The enginewright at the time of the accident was named Crossland. He had only taken charge on the day before, though he had been employed at the colliery for some time as foreman over the top men. It was not necessary for a banksman to leave the pit mouth to hang tickets up when men were riding in the shaft.

The Coroner. Is it directly contrary to the rule.

Mr. Wardell. (to witness) And you have never known it done before?

Witness. No. I had every confidence in Leeson. We haven't a better man about the place.

By Mr. Ferns. He had examined that portion of the rope attached to the hook, and had found it in good condition. There was nothing whatever wrong with it. Jackson, the enginemnan, had never complained to him that there was anything wrong with his engine. The rests ought to have been put out immediately after the cage passed out of the pit mouth, and before it reached the detaching hook.

There was nothing to prevent an accident if the rests were not put down but the detaching hook, and this had failed in the present instance. He had found that the ring which held the detaching hook had been fractured, and this would allow the catch to slip down.

He had examined the wire connecting the signal with the engine-house, and had found that it was not slack. The evidence of the engineman, to the effect that it was slack, was not true. He did not know anything of the engineman's previous history. He considered him a competent person, and had every confidence in him. He did not know that Mr. Golightly had declined to certify him as a competent person. In fact, he had heard something quite contrary to that. He saw the engine running after the accident, and as far as he could see found nothing wrong with it. The engineman complained that one of the valves had stuck. If the valve had stuck, he would have noticed it whilst watching the engine run; but it didn't stick. It was impossible for anybody to say whether the cage would have fallen down the pit or not if the rests had been put out.

Mr. Clegg, Junior, solicitor, Sheffield, said he had received instructions to attend the inquiry on behalf of the relatives of the deceased man, Inman, but he found that Mr. Ferns was also attending on behalf of the same persons. He should like to ask the witnesses a few questions.

The Coroner remarked that it would be illegal, and he could not allow it. Mr. Clegg said he also represented the West Yorkshire Miners' Association, but he was afraid he had no legal standing.

The Coroner replied that that was the case.

Mr. Clegg subsequently stated that he had received a retainer to watch the case on behalf of the relatives of Butterworth.

Henry Golightly, enginewright, stated that he had been employed at the Waterloo and Woodlesford Collieries from 1876 until the Wednesday before the accident. The ropes were in good order when he left. Before leaving, he examined the engine and signals, and had found them in good working order. The valves had only been examined once since he was at

the pit, and that was a year ago. He had known valves to stick with new packing, but not without.

By Mr. Ferns. He set Jackson on working. He had a character with him when he came to the colliery. He considered that he was a good workman, and he had never refused to certify him. Jackson, about a week before the accident, complained that his brake was loose, and witness assisted him to tighten it. He believed that the bell of the indicator was cracked, as it did not sound well.

By Mr. Clegg. Do you know that the workmen played for three days after Jackson had been employed, because of the incompetency of the engineman? They, played on one day.

What reason did they give for not working? They considered one of the enginemen named Waterhouse, unsafe.

Did they complain that Jackson was not competent? Not, to me. I heard they had no objection to Jackson, but they had to Waterhouse.

John Crossland, the present enginewright at the pit, a stated that he was appointed to his duties on the day before the accident. He made an external survey of the machinery, and saw nothing wrong. The wire of the bottom signal, however, was rather slack, and the bell was cracked. Before entering on his duties as enginewright, he was the foreman over the labourers.

By Mr. Wardell. I never had a copy of the rules before the accident. On the day after the accident I saw a copy of them in the office, and took them. He had found that there were a number of onerous rules relating to his position as enginewright. He had not looked particularly at the duties of an enginewright before the accident. On the day of the accident, he heard the engineman, Jackson, say that he did not know what was the matter with the banksman, as he had had to "bend up" for him every time. "Bending up " meant raising the cage a little.

By Mr. Ferns. Jackson had never complained to him I that his brake was imperfect. If it had been imperfect, it was his duty to have complained to him.

By Mr. Clegg. He had been employed at the colliery for 28 years, and had never thought of applying for a copy of the rules,.

John Kirby, retired engineer, who gave evidence at the previous inquiry, was recalled. In answer to Mr. Fearn he stated that he had examined the ring which held the clips. It was constructed of cast-iron. If it had been steel or malleable iron it would not have fractured or it given way.

John Leeson, banksman, stated in addition to the evidence he gave on Monday, that he had known, on more than one occasion, the cage come down with such a force on the rests as to throw them out of position. In those cases the rope was not detached, and the cage did not go to the bottom. The rests had not been knocked out of position whilst Jackson had been employed as engineman.

Joseph Jackson, the engineman, also stated in addition to his previous evidence, that he had had to "bend up" on the morning of the accident a dozen times or more. This was caused by the absence of the banksman from his proper position. When he went to the Waterloo and Woodlesford Colliery he was not asked to produce any references as to character.

Isaac W.H. White, the certified manager, added that Crossland was one of the oldest servants of the company. He had always been a most valuable servant. In cases of break down, or anything requiring extra care Crossland had always been sent for. He had assisted in the erection of all the engines in the colliery, and the fixing of the headgear. He was a thoroughly practical man, and quite competent, in his opinion, for his position.

Before Jackson entered into the employment of the company, he asked him where he had worked previously, and having watched him at his work, he was of opinion that he was a thoroughly competent man.

The Coroner, in summing up, explained that the question arose as to whether the death of the deceased was brought about by the wilful neglect or default of anyone connected with the colliery, or whether it was one of those unfortunate circumstances which could not be avoided with the best regulations.

No one who had heard the evidence could say for a moment that there had not been neglect; but as to whether the death of the deceased had been caused by the engineman or banksman, or both, it was difficult to say.

The banksman, according to his own evidence, had neglected to lay down the rests. On the other hand, if the engineman had been attending to his

duty, the cage which had carried the deceased would not have gone so high as the gearing above the mouth of the pit.

There was some doubt as to whether the laying down of the rests would have prevented the accident, and no jury would feel safe in jeopardising the liberty of any man upon such a nice question.

Alluding to the condition of the colliery, the Coroner stated that if the jury thought it was not in a fair and reasonably good condition, and that the appliances used were not fit for the purposes for which they were required, it would be their duty to express their opinion to that effect.

In conclusion, he asked the jury to be satisfied, first, as to whether the accident was one which could have been prevented; and secondly, as to whether the accident arose from the fault of the servants of the company; and, if so, in what degree.

The jury, after retiring found a verdict of "Accidentally killed," adding that there had been neglect on the part both of the engineman and banksman, in not carrying out the rules, and that the managers of the pit had not looked after and seen the rules carried out.

They also recommended that self acting rests should be applied to the mouth of the pit, and were satisfied that if there had been a wrought iron or a malleable iron ring connected with the gearing, the accident would not have taken place at all, and that if the rests had been properly attended to the accident might have been prevented.

HEARTLESS CONDUCT OF A BROTHER-IN-LAW.

Edinburgh Evening News, Saturday 21 December 1878.

At the Wakefield Police Court yesterday, Thomas Inman, a coal miner, was brought up in custody under very singular circumstances.

The prisoner was the brother of Bob Inman, who, along with Solomon Butterworth, was killed at the Waterloo and Woodlesford Colliery on the 8th of last month.

As both the men were married and left widows and families, one of the women having six children and the other three or four, the men at the collieries made a collection on behalf of the widows and children and handed the money to Mr. Charles Waterhouse, an underviewer at the collieries.

On the 10th of November Mr. Waterhouse had a balance of £7 4s 3 1/2d in hand, and on the Sunday morning following, the prisoner went to Mr. Waterhouse, asked for the money, and promised to take it to the two widows on the following

Mr. Waterhouse then handed the £7 4s 3 1/2d to the prisoner, but instead of giving them the whole of the money, he only paid £2 to Mrs. Inman. When threatened with legal proceedings if he did not give up the balance, the prisoner produced a paper purporting that he had paid £2 16s 6d for funeral expenses, leaving a balance of £2 7s 9 1/2d still due from the prisoner.

Mrs. Butterworth told the magistrates that when the prisoner heard he was about to be prosecuted, he induced her and the other widow to sign a letter admitting that they had received all the money, but that statement was not true, and they contradicted it on the following day.

The prisoner, in defence, made very contradictory statements, one time denying the charge, and at another admitting that he had appropriated some of the money, but intended to repay it. He was then committed for trial, and bail was refused.

WINDING-UP OF A COAL COMPANY. SERIOUS STATE OF AFFAIRS IN WEST YORKSHIRE.

Sheffield Independent, 31 May 1880.

The affairs of the Waterloo and Woodlesford Coal Company were finally wound-up on Saturday. The paid-up capital is £77,000, and the deficiency account shows a loss of £109,528.

The loss on the last year's working, whilst the colliery was in the hands of the liquidators, was £1648. The amount of claims ranking for dividend is £37,195, and the liquidators declared a first and final dividend of 2s. 6d. in the pound.

The state of matters is becoming very alarming in the West Yorkshire district. Pits noted for the best house and engine coal barely average half-time, and colliers are casting about for some more lucrative means of labour, large numbers having vacated their homes and gone northwards.

