

Name: John Molyneux

Occupation: Lamp-Manufacturer and tin-plate worker.

Home: Market-street, Manchester.

Date: 24th March 1820

Source: *Trial of Henry Hunt* 147-149

Summary: Was not alarmed by the presence of the crowd at SPF. Had attended a dinner with *Hunt* previously, during which *Paine*'s memory was toasted. This evidence was disallowed by the court. 'I heard a toast given "To the immortal memory of *Thomas Paine*;" *Mr. Hunt* was in the chair.

Done by: RH

John Molyneux, examined by *Mr. Hunt*—I live in Market-street, Manchester. I am a lamp-manufacturer and tin-plate worker. Market Street, though a narrow street, is one of the principal streets and great thoroughfares of Manchester. I left my shop about 11 o'clock. The street was crowded several times in the day, but I did not see any processions go through it. I did not shut up my shop in consequence of what I saw. I know *Mr. Styan*, the gunsmith. He is my next door neighbour I did not observe his shop shut when I went to the meeting at 11 o'clock. I did not then observe any shops shut up about me. I left my wife's sister to take care of the shop. If I had apprehended any danger, I would not have left my shop at all. I returned to my shop before twelve, I saw no necessity of shutting up my windows. When I returned from the meeting it was by the way of Back King Street. I saw no shops shut up, except the toy-shop and the saddler's shop at the end of the street. I went again there at twelve. I met my daughter on the ground. She expressed a wish to go on and went with her uncle. My daughter is 16 years of age. I remained on the field till the meeting was dispersed. My daughter remained with me and my brother-in-law. I saw the military arrive.

By the Court. -- I was in a situation to see them from the time they arrived in front of *Mr. Buxton's*. In the course of that day I saw not the least to create in my mind, or in the mind of any body with whom I conversed, any alarm. I heard no alarm expressed. No opposition was made to the military that I saw. There was no groaning, or hooting, or hissing at them. I perceived nothing done to intimidate them. I saw no stones, or sticks, or brickbats thrown, at them, or thrown in the air.

Cross-examined by *Sergeant Cross*, —I was at a meeting before, which was a similar kind. It was when *Mr. Hunt* was there. I believe *Mr. Hunt* presided on that occasion. I do not remember *Mr. Johnson* on the hustings. I dined with *Mr. Hunt* and others that day at the Spread Eagle. There were speeches and toasts. I heard a toast given "To the immortal memory of *Thomas Paine*;" *Mr. Hunt* was in the chair.

Justice Bayley - Is this evidence?

Sergeant Cross & *Mr. Sergeant Hullock* submitted that it was evidence, if it showed that *Mr. Hunt* had, by speeches or toasts, incited to disloyalty or disaffection.

Justice Bayley said, he would allow them to put any question as to the character of the witness: the witness had admitted that he was present when an improper toast was given; but then this was at a dinner in January, and it did not follow that because a man was disloyal in January, he should also be disloyal in August.

Mr. Scarlett observed, that similar evidence was found in the case of *Horne Tooke and Hardy*.

Mr. Hunt replied, that that was part of the case, and did not refer to any time previously to the particular acts charged. He (and *Mr. Hunt*) had been invited to the dinner, and anything which fell from him there, or which was said by others could not, he submitted, be now urged as evidence against him, unless it could be sworn that it tended to produce the conspiracy charged.

After some long and desultory observations on both sides, *Justice Bayley*, who had in the meantime looked into the case of *Horne Tooke*, decided, that the question was one which ought not to be put. It was not, he conceived, proper to bring any act of the defendants against them now, which occurred before the period of the present charge. If any indictment were preferred against a man for perjury, it would not be admissible to say that up to the period of the alleged crime he it been in the constant habit of not telling the truth.

It was then contended by the counsel for the prosecution, that the question ought to be put, as it might affect the character of the party.

Justice Bayley admitted it might in another shape; but thought it would be legal in another manner, yet, having got at it in an illegal way now, he held that it could not be received. As the defendant had given evidence of character it was competent to the prosecutors to give also general evidence of the character, but not in this way.

The question was not admitted.

Examination continued. —*Mr. Hunt* was in the chair at that meeting. I do not remember *Johnson, Knight, Bamford, or Moorhouse* being present. I believe *Mr. Hunt* made a speech after dinner. I did not hear him say that he would be amongst them soon again. I had no expectation of the kind. He was, I believe, called on to take the chair by the committee. I was not one of the committee. I was not at *Mr. Johnson's* house before the 16th of August, I never was there in my life. I attended the meeting on the 16th of August. I cannot say that I disapproved of the objects of that meeting.