

Name: John Robinson
Occupation: Merchant
Home: Manchester
Date: 29 September 1819
Source: Lees Inquest 134 – 146
Summary: Very detailed account of the nature of the sabreing actions taken by members of the Yeomanry at St.Peter's-field, (not Cavalry) and is able to identify Reid as one of these individuals.
Done by: CW

Mr: JOHN ROBINSON, of Manchester, merchant, called in, and examined by Mr. ASHWORTH.

Q. Have you subscribed any sum of money towards deferring the expenses of this prosecution?

A. No, I have not.

Q. Have you not assisted in promoting it?

A. No, Sir.

The Witness sworn, and examined by the CORONER.

Q. Will you say what you know of the death of John Lees?

A. I went to the Manchester Meeting on the 16th of August, and had remained on the ground about five or ten minutes, when I was joined by a friend or two.

Q. At what time was this?

A. At about a quarter past one o'clock.

Q. What part of the ground were you at?

A. I was within fifteen or twenty yards of the house which I have known by the name of Cooper's Cottage, and remained there for a quarter of an hour. When Mr. Hunt came, he went immediately to the hustings, and I was presently surprised at seeing the Manchester Cavalry coming at the speed they did to the ground. They came at such a rate, that I had great difficulty in getting out of their way, and had almost fallen in the effort to save myself from being rode over. After they had passed me, I turned my eyes towards Peter-street, and saw two men lying on the ground, about ten or fifteen yards from me, and who were then in the act of getting up. The Cavalry halted a short distance from me, in front of the houses in one of which the Magistrates were. After they had been drawn up a minute or two they brandished their swords in the air, and gave three shouts; at the expiration of which, they made off towards the hustings at full speed. I looked very attentively, and seeing many people on the ground, who had been thrown down by the Cavalry, I was much shocked. On looking towards the hustings I saw the horsemen cutting on every side: I then retired, for I had seen quite enough to strike me with horror. My feelings were such that I could stop no longer; and I retired to a friend's house in Mosely-street, a back window of which presented a view of a part of the ground. I looked from thence, but could discern nothing but

confusion. I remained at the window from ten to twenty minutes, during which time I saw nothing but soldiers galloping after men, women, and boys, in every direction: In the dispersion of the people the Cavalry appeared violent in the extreme.

Q: What became of the people?

A. Some were flying from them down Lloyd-street, Cooper-street, and towards St. Peter's Church; after that I came and walked down Lloyd-street, behind the Quakers' School-room, to my house, in Quay-street.

Cross-examined by Mr. ASHWORTH.

Q. You did not know John Lees?

A. No, Sir.

Q. Can you identify any one of the Cavalry?

A. Yes, Sir; I can identify Reid, who keeps the Globe Tavern, near Garthside-street, as one of the Yeomanry present: there were others whom I know, but not by name.

Q. Where did you see Reid?

A. He went into the crowd with those who made the charge. There is one thing I forgot to mention, that is, I saw one of the leaders in front of the Yeomanry, I think it was the trumpeter; before the charge; he assumed a very menacing attitude, and I thought it very strange.

Q. What do you mean by a menacing attitude?

A. Brandishing his sword.

Re-examined by the CORONER.

Q. Did you see Reid do any thing to any body?

A. No, Sir, except going in with the rest.

Q. I mean strike or injure any one?

A. No, Sir.

Q. Do you know how many of the people, who were on the ground, were injured?

A. No, Sir.

Q. Do you know if they had any wounds upon them? or where they were injured?

A. No, Sir, I do not.

Q. In the situation in which you were, how near were you to Mr. Buxton's house?

A. Within about twenty or thirty yards.

Q. Before the soldiers went into the crowd, did you see any Magistrates?

A. No, Sir.

Q. Nor hear, any one exhorting the people to disperse?

A. I heard none speak but Mr. Hunt.

Q. Did you hear any thing of the Riot Act being read?

A. No, Sir.

Q. Before the Yeomanry Cavalry brandished their swords, were any shouts or huzzas raised by any persons besides the Cavalry?

A. No, Sir; I cannot call to mind that there were.

Q. Or after the Cavalry shouted?

A. No, Sir; not that I remember.

Q. Who commanded the Cavalry ranged in front of Mr. Buxton's house?

A. I cannot say.

Q. Did the Cavalry halt upon their way, or proceed immediately to their station?

A. They went immediately to their position, where they formed, and from thence to the hustings; and when I saw them cutting at those who had the poles of the banners, I went away immediately.

Q. How did they go? in line or files?

A. Two or three abreast.

Q. They did not halt on their way, you say?

A. Not that I perceived, but they appeared confused.

Q. Where did they become confused?

A. About half way towards the hustings.

Q. What do you suppose occasioned that confusion?

A. The impression on my mind was, that some of the men had more humanity than others, and pulled up their horses in consequence.

Q. Did it appear to you that any obstruction was offered by the people, from stones being thrown, or sticks used?

A. No, Sir; there was no opposition that I saw.

Q. You say you left immediately after they began to strike at the poles of the banners?

A. Yes; directly I saw the sabres strike at the people who held the banners, I went away.

Q. Do you know any of the soldiers who struck at the banners?

A. No, Sir; they were Yeomanry, but I cannot identify them.

Q. You say you saw persons lying on the ground, do you know whether they were wounded or bleeding?

A. I do not; I cannot say they were bleeding, as I was at too great a distance.

Q. Did you see any stones or brick bats thrown at any one?

A. No, Sir; none were thrown while I was there.

Q. Did you know John Lees?

A. No, Sir; I did not know him.

Q. How far were the people, who were laying on the ground, from you?

A. About forty yards as near as I can speak.

Q. Did you ever say you knew John Lees, or could prove his being hurt?

A. No, Sir.

The Coroner—Then I don't know what brought you here; you ought not to have been produced, and the gentlemen who called you must know that.

Mr. Harmer—By this gentleman's evidence, one of the Yeomanry, named Reid, has been identified as being on the field, and I understood you to say that you would receive evidence on that point; but I consider the witness carries the case still further, by showing, that Reid was one of the Yeomanry, who went in the violent manner he has described to the hustings, and caused the people to be thrown down. I would first wish to ask Mr. Robinson, whether the people were struck down on the ground by the Yeomanry?

A. There was nothing else to cause it, and I verily believe they were injured by the Cavalry.

The Coroner—I do not think the evidence of this witness applies to the case.

Mr. Harmer.—I did not think, Sir, there would be any necessity for me to repeat the law. I now say distinctly, that all persons present, aiding and abetting in the attack, are equally criminal— equally liable to the consequences which resulted from their intruding themselves into this peaceable meeting; they all, by an act of unjustifiable violence, caused the death of the deceased; and every one may be charged with it, the same as the individual, who actually inflicted the injuries which occasioned that death.

Mr. Ashworth—I dispute this doctrine; and I could quote numerous authorities in support of my argument, but I will not fill your already crowded Court with law books. One case, however, I will cite, and this case completely establishes the position I have taken. It is the case of Demaree and Purchase, 9th Queen Anne. Demaree was indicted and convicted of high treason, by reason of being concerned in the destroying of meeting houses, which was adjudged to be levying of war against the Queen. Purchase was indicted for aiding, abetting and comforting the other in the treason; and upon the trial a special verdict, setting forth the facts, was found by the direction of the court. The judges decided against the prisoner; but three of those judges dissented from that decision. You will, however, find, upon a reference to the

case, that there were many persons present who did not do any act, but were merely present, and no act being proved against them, it was determined, that to incur guilt, a person must do the act, or must be present aiding and assisting, and those who were present, without assisting, were held guiltless; and it is an undisputed doctrine, that where a principal is not identified, the accessory cannot be convicted.

The same line of argument was adopted by Mr. Raincock, at Lancaster, in defending several individuals from Middleton, upon whose trial the Judge, in summing up to the Jury, observed, that they who were merely present, and looking on, were not guilty. If I were even to admit, that the meeting was lawful, I still cannot admit that all who were active in the dispersing of it, are guilty of the murder of the deceased, because some one individual, nobody knows who, inflicted injuries which caused death.

The law I lay down is this, that, in the present instance, some person or persons must be identified by name or description, as having inflicted the injuries which caused the death of John Lees, or aiding and abetting those who so inflicted the injuries.

I say, the law lays it down, that in all these kind of cases, the party must be accused, either of doing the act, or of aiding and abetting; but to accuse a person of aiding and abetting, there must be a principal, and unless the principal be identified, you cannot fix a person as an accessory. With this case, the evidence (I am speaking of Mr. Robinson's testimony) can have nothing to do. It would apply to any investigation, as well as to this in which you are engaged. You must require that some person or persons be identified, as having done the act which caused the death. This, Sir, is the law, and I call upon you, as the Judge of this Court, to stop the course which is pursued with such pertinacity by the gentlemen opposite. That, course goes to involve in guilt so many, as to leave us in the dark where it will stop. Every one present, and not immediately connected with the persons forming the meeting, might be involved in guilt. Such might be the case with regard to myself, for I was present; although, if it were an illegal meeting, I own I had no business there, and ought to have been absent.

I must again urge you, Sir, not to permit such evidence to be again brought before you. The whole which has been already given of the same kind, is irrelevant: and, I again say, it behoves the gentlemen, who seem so anxious to accuse, first to prove who struck the blow, before they can be suffered to give evidence of any particular persons having been active in the mere dispersing of the meeting. I am warranted in this doctrine by the case which I have before named, of Demaree and Purchase, and there are abundant other cases to confirm it, if it were necessary. The witness has mentioned the name of one of the Yeomanry Cavalry, and others are sought to be named. Really, Sir, it makes my very blood curdle, when I contemplate the mischief that is likely to follow from such a course of proceeding. Only consider, Sir, the idea of a person being thus held up to the indignation of the populace, and thus marked out for vengeance. This can be for no good purpose; it is a mere wanton attack from first to last, the motive of which cannot be disguised. It cannot fail to agitate the feeble mind, and keep alive animosities at a time when it is desirable that every thing connected with the late events should be buried in oblivion, and all effervescence subside. There is another object in view—to set one class against another, and thus to answer some particular party purposes. I hope, Sir, that you will not countenance such conduct by receiving this evidence, nor any that does not charge some person, by name or description, with inflicting wounds or bruises on the deceased. At all events, malice against the deceased must be shewn to exist, on the part of those whom, I understand, are to be accused, and for whom I attend here to-day. The legal account of the death must be from those who saw and can identify the person giving the blow; and God forbid that, without such evidence, any man should have his life, or his reputation, placed in jeopardy. Why, Sir, are you to be made the medium of setting man against man? And why are you to be called on to hear

testimony only to assist motives which cannot be misunderstood? and when you see evidence produced which is not applying to the fact, what other object can it have, other than to irritate party feeling? I trust, Sir, that, as Judge of this Court, you will not receive any further evidence, unless it appears to you that it is to the purpose I have mentioned; for none other can conduce to the ends of justice.

Mr. HARMER—I have heard, with astonishment and surprise, the learned Counsel's oration, for argument I cannot call it. I took the liberty, Sir, at the commencement of this discussion, to state, that in my view of the law on this subject, every person who took an active part in the violent dispersion of the meeting of the 16th, was answerable for the consequences, and as death ensued, they were, in the eye of the law, all guilty of murder; and I assure you, Sir, that nothing urged by the learned Counsel has tended to alter my opinion, or remove my position. Mr. Robinson has proved to you, that the person he named, was one of those who followed the man he described as galloping into the crowd, flourishing his sword in a menacing manner. Must not Reid, and all those who followed that man so galloping into a crowd, be convinced his object was to commit violence of a deadly nature? and if so, I venture to assert, that if death was occasioned by any one, they were all, in point of law, guilty of murder, although it cannot be ascertained by which individual the death blows were given. I say they were all principals, because they were present, aiding and abetting in the general design; and if this were not so, what a strange anomaly would be presented, namely, that if one individual slew another, he should be convicted of murder; but that, if several persons confederated and contrived their plan so dexterously as although they were all assisting, still the hand of the actual assassin could not be distinguished, they should all escape? This surely would be a doctrine contrary to common sense and common justice; but yet, if I understand the learned gentleman's argument, he would contend that this is the law of England. For the credit and honour, however, of British jurisprudence, I will contend that this is not the law of the country.

I agree, Sir, with the learned Counsel, that I must either prove who actually inflicted the blows, or who were present aiding and abetting; but I deny that I am precluded from doing the latter until I have done the former. Had we been discussing the doctrine of principal and accessory, the arguments you have just heard, might have some weight; and the learned gentleman very dexterously endeavours to delude you by wishing you to consider this as a question of principal and accessory. If it were so, I should yield to his doctrine, for every man possessing the least knowledge of the criminal law, must know, that in felony, there cannot be an accessory without a principal felon. But, Sir, I mean to contend, that in the case now in the course of investigation, there is no accessory; I charge the whole as principals, not only the person who inflicted the wound, if [he can be discovered, but all who accompanied him when the act was committed. The person who gave the blow, is a principal in the *first degree*, and they who were with him are principals also, but in the *second degree*.

It is attributed to us, that we are so cruel and unjust as to accuse all the Cavalry, whether they took an active part or not, nay, even if they were passive spectators. God forbid I should attempt any thing of the kind: but I mean to say, that whoever used his sword, or spurred on his horse to occasion the injury or death of any individual in that meeting, lawful, peaceable, and quiet, as it was, are as much guilty of the murder of this youth, as the person who struck the fatal blow; because, it will be recollected, that the attack and dispersion of the meeting was one continued act, in which the whole of the Yeomanry body joined, and the deceased received his injuries in the onset.

When the gentleman asserts, that no individual is implicated in the death of the unfortunate subject of this inquiry, unless he had actually committed violence upon him, does he, I will again ask, make that assertion as law? Will he give such an opinion in writing? Can he produce a single authority to that effect? I have a better

opinion of the learned gentleman's talent and discretion, to suppose he will. I consider it as the mere assertion of the advocate, and not of the lawyer. He has, indeed, quoted one solitary case: I think he says it is the King against Demaree and Purchase, but I wish he had favoured me with a sight of the report; I wish he had produced the case itself. It is one of which I have not at present a recollection, but if the learned Counsel will produce it, I pledge myself that it will be found not to bear him out in his argument. The law, as laid down by the learned Counsel, is, as I said before, at variance with that of every text writer, and, indeed, with common sense; and if he has authorities to support him, I challenge him to produce them. He is living in the neighbourhood, and has, no doubt, a good library of his own, besides access to all others in Manchester, and yet, he does not produce a single book. What is the palpable inference?—Why, that he cannot find one to answer his purpose.

Mr. Ashworth—It is not to be expected I should carry a travelling library with me.

Mr. Harmer (*in continuation*)—The learned gentleman says, he is not to carry his library with him. Still, Sir, in a matter of such moment, the learned Counsel ought, I think, if any such cases did exist, to produce them, in support of what he lays down as law. I have not such facilities as the learned gentleman; still, however, with a little industry and assistance, I have been able to collect a few authorities, which, with your permission, I will now proceed to read.

It is laid down by Hawkins, that, "to justify homicide there must be some unavoidable necessity." Where was there here any necessity? Were not all the persons against whom the warrant was issued apprehended without resistance; and if they, the principle persons at this meeting, were thus taken into custody, what reason is there to doubt that any of the mere auditors might have

* These defendants were severally indicted for that they, with a multitude of people, to the number of 500, armed, &c. did traitorously levy war, &c. During the trial of Dr. Sacheverell, in 1709, the rabble followed him from Westminster to his lodgings, and after remaining there a short time, there was a cry of "*down with the Presbyterians:*" presently, a person unknown, proposed to pull down the meeting-houses, and the cry became general, "*down with the meeting-houses*" and they went away, led on by Demaree, and destroyed a meeting-house belonging to a Mr. Burgess, and then agreed to go and destroy the rest of the meeting-houses. Hearing that the military were coming to intercept them, they separated into different bodies, each of which were to attack and destroy particular meeting-houses that night. Demaree went with one party to Drury Lane, and demolished a meeting-house, and while the materials were burning, Purchase first appeared: he came up very drunk, and with, a drawn sword, encouraged the rabble, and incited them to resist the guards, who just then came up. All the Judges present at the trial, agreed that Demaree was clearly guilty, and he was convicted, but there was a diversity as to Purchase, because there was no evidence that he was present at the original rising, or was present at any of the outrages of that night, or had any concern in them, except his behaviour at the bonfire, and therefore, as to him, a special verdict was taken. On consideration, all the Judges, with the exception of three, held that Purchase was guilty, because what he did, was in defence of persons engaged in the very act of rebellion. For whoever joins deliberately in the execution of ANY UNLAWFUL ACT, must abide the consequences at his peril. Vide East's Pleas of the Crown, vol. i. p. 75.

been dispersed by the civil power, or secured if necessary? In Mackally's case it was decided by all the judges, after two days argument, that where the death blow was given by one in the presence of others, that it was the blow of all. Mr. Justice Blackstone says :* "A man may be principal in an offence in two degrees. A principal in the first degree, is he that is the actor or absolute perpetrator of the crime; and in the second degree, he who is present aiding and abetting the fact to be done, which presence need not always be an actual immediate standing by, within sight, or hearing of the fact; but there may be also a constructive presence, as when one commits a robbery or murder, and another keeps watch or guard at some convenient distance."

Thus, as I said before, in the present instance, they who inflicted the wounds are

principals in the first degree, and they who by their presence or otherwise assisted therein, are principals in the second degree. This witness has identified one person as being present, and it is for the Jury to decide upon this evidence.

The learned gentleman, in the course of his address, told you, *"that it made his blood curdle to hear the names of individuals of a particular body mentioned, connected with the transaction of the 16th of August."* We have also heard from himself, that he was on the ground, and I know from other sources, that he witnessed the horrible proceedings of that fatal day; I therefore ask him, *did his blood curdle THEN?* If not, I give him little credit for his sympathetic feelings.

The Learned Gentleman has addressed you very pathetically, on the bad effects likely to result from the names of the yeomen being mentioned. He says, it is keeping alive animosities, and setting one man against another, when, he thinks, every thing ought to be forgotten, and past events sunk in oblivion. These observations come with an ill grace, from the advocate of those who, a few days ago, attacked and destroyed their unarmed and unoffending brethren; but, I doubt not the Learned Gentleman, nevertheless, speaks truly the wishes of his clients; those who have been guilty of enormities which must entail odium on them while recollection lasts, may well desire a general oblivion. Those who have committed great crimes may well seek to escape retributive justice. But is it to be expected that the poor people, who were the object of vengeance, or the relations of those who suffered premature death, can so soon forget their injuries?—or that the insulted laws are to sleep on the occasion, and permit the offenders to escape with impunity? I cannot believe that the Learned Gentleman is speaking his own sentiments; it surely is not possible, that his sensibility is of such a nature that it sympathizes only with the criminal and is indifferent to the victims of criminality. Such generosity, let me tell him, as would recommend oblivion to oppression, and refuse relief to the oppressed, is irreconcilable with justice, is inconsistent with universal humanity, and is particularly repugnant to British law.

* 4, Black. Com. 84;

The Learned Gentleman has often repeated his former insinuations, respecting the motives by which I am actuated, and I can only answer as I did before, by asserting that I have no party feeling to gratify; that I am conducting the case without any view to political purposes; and that my motives are as unimpeachable as his own, however pure they may be.

With respect to my ability in conducting the evidence, I must speak with more diffidence. I am in an entirely new, and to me, trying situation; I feel that I have an awful responsibility cast upon me, and a task to which I am certainly very incompetent. Unaccustomed to speak in public, and filling an humble situation in my profession, I confess myself unequal to the contest with an expert and experienced Barrister. I am not, however, of a temper or disposition to be subdued by slanderous insinuations; conscious of my own integrity, I shall always repel them with contempt. And as to my being compelled to alter my course of proceeding, I beg to say, I could not do so without being guilty of an abandonment and dereliction of duty. I feel, as I think every other man would, when advocating such a cause, that no consideration ought to induce me to depart from that line of conduct which I consider morally and legally correct. I shall, therefore, follow the course I have already pursued, in doing all in my power to bring the truth to light, and detect, if possible, the authors and perpetrators of this cruel tragedy.

The Learned Gentleman has alluded to the justification he might offer for dispersing the meeting, on the ground of its being illegal. As the character of the meeting will be a question for the consideration of the Jury, and them only, I wish to

abstain from observing upon it, but before I sit down I would make this remark, that the conduct of the civil and military power demonstrates, that *destruction* and not *dispersion* was the object; and to show that the meeting was not illegal, I could not have a stronger instance than the admission of my learned adversary, who says, that he himself was present among the people.

Mr. Ashworth (*to Mr. Harmer*)—I was there, it is true, and if the meeting was illegal, I was certainly there improperly; but still I was only there from curiosity.

Mr. Harmer (*to Mr. Ashworth*)—And such, Sir, was the case with many who were maimed and murdered.

The Coroner—Mr. Harmer, I do not think Mr. Robinson's evidence applicable; he has not gone to prove that the person he named was aiding and abetting in the death of John Lees. He does not prove that the man rode over the persons. I wish to have someone produced, who will prove the identity of the person of the deceased, and of those by whom he was injured.

Mr. Harmer—With great deference, Sir, I still insist that his evidence strongly applies to the case. It has been already shown, that the deceased was cut by the Yeomanry, when they arrived at the hustings, and Mr. Robinson identifies one of those Yeomanry who went up to the hustings; and if it were necessary (which I contend it is not) to show who gave the cut, Mr. Robinson's evidence is sufficient to go to the Jury even on that point.

The Coroner—I am not satisfied that John Lees was cut by the Manchester Cavalry.

Mr. Harmer—That is a question for the Jury. It is they who are to be satisfied on that head.

The Coroner—Well; we had better proceed. Will you ask this witness any further question?

The Witness examined by Mr. HARMER.

Q. Did you see the different bodies of people arrive in the town before you went to the field?

A. I did not. I saw none till I was on the field. I was engaged in business until half-past twelve o'clock.

Q. How long were you on the ground altogether?

A. About half an hour.

Q. Were you there when the Yeomanry Cavalry came in?

A. I was.

Q. Was there any riot or tumult on the part of the people, previous to that time?

A. Not any.

Q. Was there any indication or disposition to riot manifested by the people?

A. Not the least.

Q. Did you see any Magistrate or any other person exhort the people to quit the field; or give them the slightest notice to disperse, before the Cavalry charged?

A. No, I did not.

Cross-examined by Mr. ASHWORTH.

Q. Did you see any banners on the field?

A. Yes.

Q. How many?

A. I can't say, I did not count them.

Q. Did you see a black flag near the hustings?

A. I saw a dark coloured one. I did not know it was black. I could not swear it was.

Q. Was there any inscription that you can recollect on that flag?

A. I cannot speak as to inscriptions.

Q. How many caps of liberty were there?

A. I cannot say how many. I saw some red things on poles, but did not know what they called them.

Q. Were there ten?

A. I should think not so many; but I can't swear as to the number, as I did not count them; and I wish to speak only as to what I know.

Q. How long were you on the ground before the Cavalry came?

A. About thirty or forty minutes.

Q. How many persons had then assembled?

A. A large body, but I cannot say how many. I cannot form an opinion, the number was so great.

Q. Was there no proclamation made for silence!

A. Not that I heard.

Q. Was there any noise among the people?

A. I heard only shouting by the people, when Hunt came on the ground, and likewise by the Yeomanry, when they arrived.

Q. Did you hear any other shouting?

A. No.

Q. Did the Yeomanry move in any particular way, when they made what you call a charge?

A. I cannot say whether they did or not. They all went forward.

Q. Did they go in line or file?

A. I cannot say.

Q. Will you swear there was more than three abreast?

A. I cannot swear, because I don't know.

Q. Why do you call it a charge if you do not know how they went?

A. Let it be in whatever way it was, I considered it a charge. I cannot give any further description, as I know nothing of military phrases; and speak only to the best of my belief.

Q. You say there was confusion, was not the line broken in upon by the people, so as to separate them?

A. When they got about half way to the hustings, they appeared to be in great confusion, and the line was not so perfect as it was when they started, but I do not think they were separated.

Q. Did you not see the line broken in upon?

A. No, I did not.

Q. Can you then describe what occasioned the confusion?

A. I cannot; but there was great confusion.

Q. Did they not stop in their way to the hustings?

A. I don't think they stopped once.

Q. Can you not tell what created the confusion?

A. I cannot tell any more than what I have already stated.

Q. If stones had been thrown could you have seen them?

A. I think I could.

Q. How far could you see?

A. About forty yards.

Q. Did you see any stone thrown?

A. I did not.

Q. If any thing was between you and an object, do you think you could see it so clearly as if there was no impediment?

A. I do not understand your question.

Q. Why, for instance, if your attention was to be drawn to the persons who are standing in the last row there (*pointing to the audience*) could you see them as well as if there were no persons between them and you, that is, as well as if all the front rows were away?

A. Certainly not, how can any one see an object so well, if the view is intercepted, as

when there is nothing to obstruct it.

Q. Then why did you not answer my question at first?

A. Because I really did not understand it. How could I suppose, you were asking me to give an opinion, on so self-evident a proposition.

Q. From the distance you were situated, might not stones have been thrown without your seeing them, considering the great number of persons that intervened between you and the soldiers?

A. I think not; and I saw none thrown.

Q. Did you see Mr. Hunt when the Cavalry came in?

A. Yes; Mr. Hunt was upon the hustings when the Cavalry moved forward; and, I think, he was there when they cut at the banners.

Q. Did you see the Cavalry after Mr. Hunt was taken away?

A. Yes; I saw them pursuing men and boys, along Cooper-street, after Mr. Hunt had been taken from the hustings.

Q. At what time did you first see the Cavalry on the ground?

A. Soon after one o'clock.