

EXAMINATION OF MR. WM. BEESLEY,
AT BURNLEY.

BUNLEY, SEPT. 7.—This day, Mr. Beesley had been remanded from Monday, in consequence of the absence of Mr. Philip Grant, reporter for the *Morning Post Chronicle*, and occasionally for the *Morning News*. It was brought before the magistracy, on the 13th inst., by Mr. James R. Phillips, Re-Collector of Customs, charged with uttering a seditious libel on the Erection of June last, at a meeting held on Pandle-hill.

Mr. P. Grant being sworn, stated that he resided in Manchester—was a reporter—attended a meeting on the 13th inst. at Pandle-hill, which he described as follows: The meeting was did not transpire in my presence—it was held on the Sabden side of Pendle Hill.

There about half-past two o'clock in the afternoon there were about 2000 or 2500 persons present—most of whom were men; some of them were armed with quarter hieks, and appeared to have required considerable labour in the erection. There were from 20 to 30 persons on the hustings—I went on the hustings—

[illegible]

at balls while the people were starving; they should go to hundreds to the overseers and a relief; they should also go to the parsons and ask of them to do the same; they should go to the next General Election, they should elect men, by the voice of the people, and if they were of the admissibility into the House, and were blue water, they should make a Commons House of Commons; and these who thought working men were worse off, for if they lost an arm or a leg, they were worse off; but if they were determined to resort to violence, if they would show him that they should not go to a leader, he would lead them on to victory.

Mr. Beeley cross-examined the witness, and asked him if he had been at the police office on the previous day going to the meeting—that he had been there from the *Times* in company with him—that he travelled together in a gig to Saddon, that the witness stayed at a public-house in Saddon, that he had been at the meeting—that he left the meeting at three o'clock, the business being concluded. Beeley spoke a considerable time—and that other speakers addressed the meeting during the time he was there. He then asked the witness if he had a report with a copy of his notes, and then given to the superintendent of police in Burnley. Mr. Grant was one of those who went from Burnley to Liverpool to swear against the Chartists as a business man. Mr. Grant was evidently labouring under severe indisposition, his appearance being such as to justify a supposition that his days or earth were few.

Mr. Beeley read a paragraph from a *Manchester paper (the Guardian)* of the 15th or 18th June, which states that he was opposed to physical force. He read a paragraph or two from the *Manchester Guardian*, and drew from the witness and that he had furnished that paper with a report, and stated, that so far from being opposed to the taking notes, he was glad he was there for the people, and gave him every facility he was able to give him, and that he was not for relying the people meeting to rely on their moral power, and she should have, by reading a paragraph from a letter from

O'Connor to the Charlatels of North Lancashire, had been the subject of a resolution of the Council of the 15th June, as a gross and base misrepresentation. He had done this when he had not the idea of a prosecution being pending; he had done so in order to set himself right with the public. I think that he was not aware of the fact that he was doing this, after having stood over thirteen years now to institute proceedings against him on the testimony of a reporter, who it was evident from the facts elicited was a wholly unscrupulous man by describing him as a "champion" for the cause.

De Waurst, of the party, the speaker, was the witness called on.

This witness was examined on Monday last, examination taken down.

When this witness was examined, he proceeded to read what purported to be his deposition given on 30th June the witness confirming what was read to him.

Mr. Beasley protested against this mode of proceeding, stating that what was then read was not his deposition, but a statement made on Monday. It appeared to him (Mr. Beasley) to have been made in the office and now presented to the witness in polished form, so that it would answer the end of the prosecutor, by the witness swearing to it. This was a grossly wrong idea how the witness intended to be done—

Clerk reads to the witness, you say that the defendant said was calculated to excite the people to breach of the peace? and the witness was compelled to answer, yes. He then asked him whether it had been read, to keep the peace, or to set fire to country, he would have answered, Yes. Sir Beasley appealed to the bench and remarked, it was a gross misstatement of the facts, and he would produce a better testimony than that which he should be set at liberty. It was then agreed the witness should be again examined, and the position taken down. In answer to question whether he said he was not a member of the League on Sunday the 12th of June; cannot tell whether he was for, but "o rakkun it year a meening. Hear Beasley begin to talk. There came or three thousand folks present. They came on the 12th, for one, there were five or six men on the lings. He gave a view of physical force.—I was six yards from the hustings. He encouraged the people to come forward and unite in one body. He said that he was not a member of the League. He said something about a number of men it had gotten how many) going to the Parliament house

demanded admittance to redress their grievances they were defeated by bluegown men, they thought the Queen's salary was too high. It was something about the Queen's salary—could not tell—was it was either £800 or £8000, could not tell—what he said was calculated to excite the people. The *Chatter*—did not give his opinion in any way about that. Mr. Beasley here wished the clerk down what the witness actually stated, namely, did not recommend physical force. The clerk would when the witness asked it. After some Mr. Beasley asked the witness, "Do you parlay?" Thereby put the question to the witness. I positive you did not hear him recommend force? Witness—Yes. The magistrates then the clerk to put it down in the deposition.

Mr. Beasley—Did you hear the speaker, and from him that he was sent to the meeting by student Mc Cabe? he had nothing promised him the job. Here Mc Cabe stated, that he was a constable, and after some blagging to keep his pay system, he betrays to the witness that the man is not a solicitor had no right to inter speak. The bench concurred with Mr. B. Mr. Beasley—When was you sworn in constable? Witness—Before or after the meeting? Witness—Before. Mr. Beasley—How long before? Witness—I cannot say; it was in the spring. Mr. Beasley—How long before the meeting? Was it a month or two months before? Witness—Two months, sir. Mr. Beasley—You have now stated on your oath you were sworn in constable in June, and that you were sworn in two months before the meeting. Mr. McCabe was then sworn, and stated it along with the others, took the defendant into court on Saturday the 3d of September, at 10 o'clock, and took the witness to the witness box. He took the

A of a travelling bag—read a list of its contents. Address from the Complete Suffrage Union, Joseph Sturge, and some resolutions passed at a gate meeting, were retained. Several books, three dozen of Emmet's Life and Trial—Costly. The Court was then ordered to be cleared, & magistrates to consult. When we again entered court, Mr. Bealey was informed by the clerk that he must be bound himself in £100, and two sureties £50 each, to appear at the next Assizes on Monday. He refused to do so, and was immediately ordered against him for uttering a seditious libel. He was immediately tendered, and accepted. Mr. Bealey was bound over to prosecute, and the witnesses were bound to appear. He was then ordered to appear and give evidence, when Mr. Bealey was at liberty, and retired with his friends. Mr. Bealey making his appearance before the Court on the 2nd inst. for the charge on the 3rd inst.

DEVONPORT, Saturday.—The Archduke Frederick of Austria landed here to-day at two o'clock, having arrived in command of the Austrian frigate Be-

