

By Mr. Bennie: I have not seen dust in any quantity anywhere in this mine. There is very little timber used in this mine in comparison with other mines. There were no recesses in the mine where dust could accumulate in great quantities. I did not observe dust on the walls of the roads in what I would call dangerous quantities. I would consider there was sufficient inert dust in the stone drive to render the coaldust there harmless. In other portions of the mine the moisture of the coaldust would make it harmless. About one-third of the main haulage-way ran through stone. This is to No. 5. From No. 5 to Dooley's two-thirds of the haulage-road would be in a stone drive. It is the practice in the mine in the working-bords to work the coal down to the fireclay floor. If the floor such as this were watered a creep would come on, caused by the pressure from above. I think since the explosion that parts of the walls and roads required inert dust to be scattered upon them. I did not think so before the explosion.

By Coroner: If there was no dust on the sides and the dust on the floors was watered, the initial explosion might have created sufficient dust to carry on the explosion by knocking pieces of coal about. In my opinion, the initial explosion would be a small one. If I had been manager, and saw that there was dust on the sides and roof, and the dust was dangerous, I would have had the walls and roof watered or scattered with inert dust. A manager ought to be able to judge if the dust was of a dangerous nature.

By Mr. Tunks: I did not think it was a dusty mine when I worked in it—that is, two years ago. In my opinion, the condition of the mine could not be materially different from what it was two years ago.

By Coroner: The old workings were not watered, and I would not consider it necessary to water them now. My reason for that is that persons are not likely to be there with a naked light.

---