

William

Wm. B. L.

# The Waterford Chronicle.

No. 2177.

THURSDAY, JULY 31, 1834.

Price 6d.

## IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

### HOUSE OF LORDS—FRIDAY, JULY 25.

The royal assent was given by commission to the sale of tea bill, the Irish land securities bill, the hanging-in-chains abolition bill, the Roman Catholic marriages (Scotland) bill, and several private bills.

### WESTERN RAILROAD BILL.

A brief discussion took place upon this bill, and a division, when the bill was rejected by a majority of 17—47 voting against, and 30 for it.

### BUSINESS OF PARLIAMENT.

Lord WINCHILSEA said, he had two questions to ask the premier—one question was, as to the foreign policy of the present ministers, which was, whether they would interfere against the pretensions of Don Carlos? He declared in a very long speech that the present government degraded this country. As to the prostitution of the country, he would ask them, in the name of that spirit, the spirit of Protestantism, which had long overshadowed them with its holy influence, whether they still intended to protect them from the injurious attempts which were every day making upon them, and which threatened ere long, unless prevented, to involve them and the people of England in one common ruin?

Lord MELBOURNE declared that Lord Winchilsea's questions, which he had asked in a very lengthy speech, were both ill-timed and unobjectionable. If Lord Winchilsea, he said, were displeased with the course the government was pursuing, the more usual course would be to enter their protest on the journals of the house, and forward an address to the King calling for their dismissal.

Lord LONDONDERRY complained of the manner in which his noble friend was replied to, and then asked, if the government had stopped vessels going to the aid of Don Carlos?

Lord MELBOURNE replied, that he had not heard of such a circumstance.

The house then proceeded with the discussion of the poor-law amendment bill, and disposed of it up to the 51st and 52d clauses. It then adjourned to the next day.

### HOUSE OF COMMONS—FRIDAY, JULY 25.

The Speaker took the chair at twenty minutes past twelve.

The O'CONNOR DON presented a petition from an individual named James Hindley, late paymaster of the 6th Dragoon.

After a few words from Sir H. HARDINGE, the petition was laid on the table.

Mr. SHAW presented petitions in support of the established church of Ireland, from the corporation of Dublin and other places.

### PANATICISM IN IRELAND.

Mr. FINCH presented a petition from William Mears, complaining of a Roman Catholic priest in Ireland having urged his people to commit violence upon a scripture-reader, who, in retaliation, only quoted some texts, for which he was taken before the magistrates and held to bail on the justification of the said priest, and praying for liberty of conscience.

Mr. O'DWYER said that if only half the statements in the petition were true, the petitioner, if he was at all imbued with the true inspiration of his calling, should consider himself the happiest man alive, as he, in the parish of Westport, had arrived nearly at the enviable state of martyrdom. (Laughter.) He was not disposed to say that magistrates like this man should be submitted to the baptismal ceremony of ducking in a horsepond; neither did he complain that he was not subjected to the annoyance of which his prototype, *Mancowen*, complained, the practice of boys tying crackers to his tail; but he was not much inclined to sympathize with the petitioner in any accidents to which this mission might render him liable, when, instead of cultivating raddies in the garden of his master, the rector of Westport, (it appeared from his statement that he filled the office of gardener to the rector,) he presumed to interfere with the concerns of the Roman Catholic clergyman. The hon. member for Stamford would mention the names of the magistrates who adjudicated on this case. What delinquency is the concernment of that material fact? He (Mr. O'Dwyer) had, however, referred to the petition, and from his knowledge of the families of these gentlemen, he would assure the house that they were all Protestants. (Cheers.) Who, then, was the authority most to be relied on—the magistrates of Westport, who sent this fellow to goal, and to the treadmill he hoped, or the statement of the petitioner, even aided by the advocacy of the tolerant and unimpassioned member for Stamford? (Laughter.) He was most happy to observe that the house had treated this matter with becoming ridicule. The truth was, that this contemptible affair was only one of the incidents in the system of unwarrantable interference with the opinions of others, which proceeded from a fanatical party in Ireland, aided by a party still more fanatical in England, who arrogated to themselves the possession of all the religion in the world. If the party to which he referred had only power, Birmingham, eminent as it was for the extent of its manufactures, would be insufficient for the requisite supply of thumb-screws and girdlons for the particular use of all those of his Majesty's subjects who were not up to the mark in point of sanctimoniousness. (Heat and laughter.)

After a few words from Mr. Finch, Mr. Langdale, Mr. Potter, Mr. Wilks, Mr. Sinclair, and Col. Verrier, the petition was ordered to lie on the table.

A brief discussion took place on the interference by the French authorities with English fishermen, after which the house adjourned.

### ADJOURNED SITTING.

### CRUOR POLICEIEN.

Captain PERCEVAL said he had a question to put to the right hon. the Secretary for Ireland, relative to the trial of two policemen who were charged with murder in an affray which took place at Cragin, in the county of Limerick, and who had been acquitted. (Hear, hear.) He wished to know from the right hon. gentleman whether he had any objection to the production of the judges' notes before whom the trial had taken place. He would not pledge himself to the accuracy of the statements contained in the public papers relative to that trial, but they were of a very extraordinary nature.

Mr. LITTLETON said he had read the reports alluded to, and had no doubt that they were accurately reported, but at the same time he knew nothing of their accuracy, and he had sufficient experience of the extreme inaccuracies of the Irish papers to prevent him from placing confidence in them.

### SUPPRESSION OF DISTURBANCES (IRELAND) BILL.

Lord ALTHORP moved that the report of the committee upon this bill should be brought up.

Mr. O'CONNELL wished to know whether the indemnity clause was to be preserved?

Lord ALTHORP said he did not think, after the best consideration, that it would be proper to abandon this clause.

Mr. O'CONNELL said that when the bill came on for the third reading, he would move, as we understood, the insertion of two new clauses.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL gave notice that he would move the insertion of a clause to the effect of directing the Lord Lieutenants of counties, and the chief magistrates of cities and counties, to post up in the most public places of the district copies of proclamations of the Lord Lieutenants of Ireland, revoking any former proclamation.

### INCREASE OF PUBLIC OFFICERS.

Mr. GOULBURN said that early in this session he had moved for returns of the increase or diminution of the number of public officers that had taken place within the year. The return that had been laid upon the table was of a very unsatisfactory nature, and gave by no means the required information. There was a statement made in that return, that the number of offices reduced amounted to 221, and the number increased was 728, leaving a balance of 507 in favor of reduction.

What would the house say when he (Mr. G.) informed them that the actual number of offices increased amounted to three hundred and twenty-two, thus giving a large addition of patronage to the government. (Hear, hear.) It was stated in the same return that the amount saved by reductions during the year was £30,000; but the fact was, that there was an increase of £85,000 in the expenses of the state and the patronage of the government. (Hear, hear.) He would take the liberty of reading an abstract of the offices created during the year, and the nature of them. On looking over them, he found them no less than 425. (Hear.) Of these there were the following rates of salary:—

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Offices of £6,000 a year and upwards, one. | (He did not include the appointment of Mr. Macaulay.) |
| Offices of £3,000, and under £6,000        | 1   |
| 2,000                                      | 3,000   |
| 1,000                                      | 2,000   |
| 800  | 1,000   |
| 600  | 800   |
| 400  | 600   |
| 200  | 400   |
| 200  | 200   |
| Total                                      | 425   |

These offices cost the country £125,000. (Hear, hear.) This was a subject to which the house ought to give its most serious attention, especially as they were offices over which the house had no control, and patronage was important to every government. (Hear, hear.) The manner in which some of the appointments were made proved that they were made for the benefit of the country? Without going into all he would take one case. Last session one million was voted to the assistance of the clergy in Ireland. The benefices there were about 1,200, and the number of parishes 2,500; therefore the applications must have been numerous. Now, had ten or twelve extra clerks been appointed for that distribution it would have been enough; but 120 persons had been engaged, and a new office, called the title owners' relief office, had been created. Of the number of persons 74 were clerks. Comparing this with the Secretary of State's Office in Ireland, and the War-office in England, it appeared that the new office employed twice the number of persons. (Hear.) There were in Ireland 32 barristers, and one would suppose that one assistant would have been enough for each; but what was the fact? Why, no less than 40 assistant-barristers had been appointed under this title million act. To distribute a sum of twenty millions over the whole of our colonial possessions, and to all the slave proprietors, only sixty appointments had been made, while to distribute one million in Ireland to the title-owners no less than 40 assistant-barristers and 74 clerks had been employed. (Hear.) He thought that in this case the right hon. gentleman had been guilty of some indiscretion. (Oh, oh.)

Mr. LITTLETON said that the barristers and clerks under the title owners' relief bill had found extraordinary labour. Not less than 2,000 schedules were received and disposed of. It was a matter of the greatest importance that the business should be got through with as much expedition as possible; and they, therefore, thought it better to employ a great number of men, as the same amount of money would be expended, whether the work was done in ten years or in ten days. (Hear.) This was the reason why 40 barristers were employed. With respect to the clerks, Sir W. Gosset had calculated that it would take one man not less than 58 years to go through the whole work, but it was necessary that the whole should be done by the end of September, and they therefore employed the number of men that was necessary to complete the work. He hoped the explanation would be satisfactory. (Hear.)

Mr. H. GRANTAN complained of the right hon. member (Mr. Goulburn) objecting to this commission, after he had sanctioned the measure under which it was issued. The right hon. gentleman had been in Ireland, and why did he not instruct the clerks to do their business better.—(Hear.) He must only infer that the right hon. gentleman was a bad instructor, and he hoped he would not instruct him. (Hear.)

Mr. F. BARING would ask the right hon. gentleman whether there were not commissions appointed in his administration—and whether the right hon. gentleman's own brother was not at the head of one of them? The real facts of the case were these:—Between 1820 and 1830, there was

a reduction of £209,000 in the salaries paid to public officers of all ranks and grades; and during the three years the present government was in power, there were abolished about one thousand three hundred and fifty-eight situations, and £259,213 of salary. The average annual difference between the reduction made by the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues, compared with those of the present government, was as £117,000 to £129,000.

Mr. HUME said that when rogues and thieves—Whigs and Tories—fell out, honest people came by their own. This was peculiarly the case in the present instance. He thought that the facts alluded to in the speech of the right hon. secretary to the treasury proved that it was imperative on the government to make out a return of temporary appointments. He (Mr. H.) saw an account of the most abominably expensive appointment, £10,000 a year, made to Mr. Macaulay, in the East Indies.

Sir R. PEEL said his honourable friend was perfectly justified in bringing the subject before the house. He would ask the house whether it was not so, on the strength of the facts stated in it? Seventy-four clerks, at £100 a year each, and forty assistant-barristers, at five guineas a day, for the distribution of a million of money. Never were there functionaries, under all the circumstances, more highly paid than these were.—(Hear, hear.)

Mr. S. RICE said the hon. member for Middlesex objected to the appointment of that brightest of the ornaments of the house, Mr. Macaulay; but his appointment and his salary had been sanctioned by parliament—he believed not opposed by the hon. member.

Mr. HUME was understood to say he had opposed it.

Mr. S. RICE concluded by deprecating the indirect course pursued by the right hon. gentleman, and asserting that it would be the more open and manly way to meet the matter by a straightforward motion.

Mr. SHEIL asked why had not the Irish corporation commission, which, he believed, had concluded its labors (and was to have made its report in the beginning of the year), made its report yet? As for the grant of a million to the Irish clergy, the necessity for that grant arose in the delay of settling the Irish church. Had the bill of 1832 been passed, that million would have been saved. Still, when the distribution of one million required 40 barristers and 70 clerks, he was happy to have to thank the government for one act of economy.

The commission of public instruction had extended its labors over the whole of Ireland, yet it consisted of but two commissioners and four clerks, and each commissioner would have to visit about 500 parishes. He wished seriously to ask of the right hon. gentleman opposite, whether it was not intended to increase the number of this commission; at present, it must, of necessity, be ineffective.

Mr. LITTLETON said the subject had recently been under consideration, and he believed, the numbers would be increased.

Mr. GROVE thought there was no more rational and justifiable expenditure than that on commissions.

Mr. COBBETT disagreed with the hon. member for London respecting all commissions, especially the poor law commission. The commissions were issued by the crown, and the commissioners were appointed by the ministers. Was it to be expected that they, knowing the opinions of their patrons, and being only temporarily appointed, would venture to make a report essentially different from theirs?

Mr. SHAW said that he was apprehensive the government designed to do this year what they did last, with respect to the Irish title question—put their hands into the public purse for another million.

### THE BUDGET.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER brought forward his financial statement. After going into extensive detail, as to the state of the finances, he adverted to the surplus on which he had calculated last year. He admitted that it was partly occasioned by demands that had not been calculated upon, as charges on account of Navarino; £100,000 to pay off seamen, &c. He concluded, however, of opinion that appropriating surplus to the reduction of taxes, instead of maintaining a sinking fund, was advisable. He calculated on possessing a surplus of £1,020,000, and that he should gain one hundred and sixty thousand pounds by adding duty, and £35,000 on beer licenses. The present duty on the house tax (previously determined upon), which would be £1,200,000. The reductions that would be effected by Mr. P. Thompson's customs duties bill, now before parliament, would be £200,000. He proposed to repeal the duties on starch, amounting to £75,000; on stone bottles and sweets, amounting to £6,000; and on almonds, amounting to £25,000. He also named small reductions in the assessed taxes, namely, the duty on a riding horse used by small farmers; the window tax on the houses of small farms; the duty on servants under eighteen years of age; the duty of a horse kept by a clergyman of any persuasion, where the income did not exceed one hundred and twenty pounds, &c. The whole reductions of these small assessed taxes he estimated at £75,000. The sum total of the reductions would be £1,381,000. Besides these reductions, he proposed to lower the duty on spirits in Ireland from 3s 4d to 2s 4d, for the purpose of more effectually checking the illicit distillation. His lordship said, besides being able to make these reductions, the revenue would meet the interest (which will be £400,000 for the portion of the financial year) on the £20,000,000 that had been voted to effect the abolition of negro slavery—a work that had astonished other countries, as that sacrifice had gone hand in hand with the reduction of taxation.

Mr. BARING considered it exceedingly bad policy in the noble lord to place the permanent

surplus so low as £200,000. The improvement in the revenue, of late years, was owing to the increasing prosperity of the country, and the consequent increase of the comforts of the people.—(Hear, and a laugh.) The noble lord's next statement was that £1,200,000 would be reduced by taking off the house tax; next, that £200,000 would be taken off by the reduction of the customs' duties. (Hear.) He must say that he never knew of £200,000 being more completely thrown away. (Hear.) The reduction would be principally upon spirits. (Hear, hear.) Gentlemen might cheer, but he must say that he could not see any reason whatever for taking off the duty on currants—(hear)—because he considered them an article of luxury. (Hear.) This was his opinion, and he had a right to express it. He contended that the proposed reductions upon farmers' dogs and horses were not reductions sufficient in amount to relieve the farmers. He thought that the noble lord might have advantageously taken off the duty on leas, in respect to farms. (Hear.) Having made these observations in respect to the noble lord's statement, he wished now to advert to the number of dissentients relative to the four per cents. He thought that the noble lord ought to have said something about them, and how he was to pay them. He (Mr. Baring) would state his views on the subject; and here he must allude to what he had heard, namely, that the government had been dealing in the stocks. It appeared by the paper, which he had in his hand, that the commissioners for the payment of the national debt had the entire control over the sinking fund, which amounted to about £1,000,000; also of the funds in the savings' banks, which amounted to £16,000,000. By the words of the act relative to savings' banks, the commissioners in question had a right to deal with the funds in the savings' banks, "if they thought it advisable." Well, these words were taken advantage of by the commissioners, for the purpose of jobbing. Well, £2,348,000 worth of stock was sold out by these commissioners. This was done, he supposed, to enable the noble lord to pay off the four per cents. This stock was converted into the exchequer bills; but what the object was in doing this, he could not say. He denied that the noble lord had benefited the savings' banks by this device; but even if he did, he denied that the noble lord had any right to do so. If the object of the noble lord was to work the stocks so as to effect a reduction of the four per cents, he could assure the house that it failed most miserably. (Hear.) He contended that if this policy were persevered in, the greatest possible injury might arise.—(Hear.) He thought it most essential that an unfair sale should be made of ministerial secrets. It was generally known that secrets were divulged to underlings. The noble lord could hardly deny this fact. He, however, was sure that the noble chancellor of the exchequer had blundered greatly in his financial operations. The noble lord himself could not deny that.

Lord ALTHORP said that there were some mistakes in the statement of the hon. gentleman. He had argued that the sale of stock was the way to rise the price of stock. He denied that in this transaction he had done any thing out of the course of his public duties. The net gain on that stock was upwards of £118,000. The hon. gentleman had said that this was the only instance which had occurred of a Chancellor of the Exchequer lowering stock that he had to sell. Now the facts were, he had lowered the 4 per cents. to 3½ per cents. There were a great many dissentients, but he was prepared at a minute's notice to pay them all off. Calling on the commissioners to-day had placed them in a very inconvenient position. He did not think that in the transaction in question there was any thing which could be complained of. He did not think that he had done any thing in which he was not perfectly justified.

Mr. BARING went into some explanation, and urged that the explanation made by the noble lord was insufficient.

Lord ALTHORP made a few observations in reply, and read a numerical calculation from a written document in support of his original statement.

After a few words from Mr. HERRIS, Mr. GOULBURN had always expected that when the country was in a state of tranquillity the labour should go on increasing. He thought that in a period of great prosperity some attempt ought to be made to make some impression on the public debt. It was to be expected that the day would come when that debt should be increased, and that possible occurrence should be now provided for by judicious and timely retrenchment. For the last three years an increase in the annual charge of the debt had taken place to the amount of £300,000 per annum. His objection to the noble lord's system of finance was that he had made no effort to lessen the debt, or weaken that pressure which had been described as a mill-stone about the neck of the country. He thought that if there was any interest particularly suffering, it was the agricultural interest, and he had to complain that in any reduction of the public burthens those interests which suffered most had been entirely overlooked. The noble lord had proposed to leave the duty as it was in Scotland, and to reduce it in Ireland.—He condemned that mode of reduction. Before he could acquiesce in this reduction, he would require some information to convince him why a different rule should be applied to Scotland and to Ireland. Unless this reduction was justified by imperative circumstances, it was an evil to colonial interests, which instead of being depressed ought to be encouraged.

Mr. P. THOMPSON said that his hon. friend had found fault with the resolutions which had been made on various articles. But he thought that he was completely mistaken in that respect. He defended the reduction of the duty upon the article of currants, which was very generally used by the poor, particularly in the north. In many cases the duties upon articles of general consumption exceeded 150 per cent., and he thought that so far as it was practicable they were bound to reduce the duties on these articles. He agreed that it would be unwise to give up a monopoly to a neighbouring country; but every day's experience convinced him that they could no longer preserve the monopoly on coals. In France and in Belgium coal fields had been open, so that

it would be quite impossible to maintain the monopoly on coals much longer. He thought that by keeping up the duty on coals, they discouraged the employment of British shipping to a considerable extent. He had received, neither from his constituents or any other body of men in this country, any opinion against this measure. His hon. friend said that there ought to be a reduction in glass and cotton. There had been a reduction last year to a large extent of the duty on cotton; and as to the duty on glass it would be difficult to get rid of it without also getting rid of the whole machinery of collecting that duty. As to the observations that had been made respecting the reduction of the debt, he would say that his noble friend had always applied his surplus to the reduction of taxation. For the last few years, in 1831, the relief was £1,253,000; in 1832, it was £739,000; in 1833, £1,636,000. In the entire five years, relief had been given to nearly the amount of nine millions, whilst the loss to the revenue had not been half that amount. The member for Essex had complained that the relief was given to the agricultural interest. Now he knew no relief could be given to them with the exception of the reduction of the malt tax, but it should be recollected that the agricultural class shared in common the general reduction of taxation. He was satisfied, notwithstanding all that had been said, that the country would go on in a state of progressive prosperity.

Sir R. PEEL thought that the repeal of the glass tax would in point of fact give more relief than the removal of the house tax, which was a bonus to the landlord. This was a most injurious tax, as it tended to the production of an inferior article. His uniform course had been to support the public credit by resisting extravagant reductions. He disapproved of the repeal of the duty on the exportation of coals. He admitted it might for a while relieve a distressed interest in the trade of England, and give a temporary stimulus to British shipping. He did not think that there was any evidence that the reproduction of coals at all kept pace with its consumption. He disapproved of this reduction, and was not satisfied that the supply of coal was at all equal to that which had been represented. If the consumer had opened coal fields, he did not pay much attention to that. The right hon. gentleman had fallen in convincing him, that there was any advantage to be gained from that reduction. He regretted that the alterations of parliament had not been called to the system of banking in this country, particularly in the provinces. He thought that the 7th of George IV. had been acted upon in a manner that he did not at all contemplate. The right hon. gentleman was late a statement on this subject.

Mr. HUME said that the noble lord ought to lay upon the table of that house a statement of the three per cent. and three and a half per cent. stock, since his operations commenced. He was not of opinion that the commissioners had it in their own power to speculate and dabble in the funds, and he thought it a most dangerous power to vest in their hands. With respect to the reduction of taxation, the honourable member expressed his regret that the noble lord had not taken off the tax on newspapers, because it was only by the diffusion of knowledge that the morals of the people could be improved. He did not know what evidence was given before the drunken committee. (Loud laughter.) He meant the committee on Drunkenness; but cert—in he was the only sure and practical remedy for this evil was the education of the people. There was one tax to which he begged to call the attention of the noble lord, which amounted to about \$60,000, and which was applicable to Scotland; he alluded to the tax on the effects of persons dying where the property was under £100. Great suits and oppressions arose from this tax, and he therefore hoped it would be taken off.

Mr. O'CONNELL complained that the stamp duties on awards were excessive. The duty on awards, when the sum did not amount to two pounds, was twenty shillings. The consequence was, that the poor people did not settle their disputes by arbitration. In fact, the only reduction of taxation which Ireland was to obtain, was the duty on whiskey, which, in fact, so far from being a benefit, was, to a certain extent, an injury.

Mr. S. RICE defended the reduction in the duty on whiskey, on the ground that it would prevent smuggling. He fully concurred with the hon. and learned gentleman that the duty on awards was most oppressive, and he was happy to state that his noble friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer had promised a remedy in the stamp duty arrangement.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER replied, and said that the government was determined to make every reduction, consistent with preserving the efficiency of the public service.

Mr. PEASE expressed his approbation of the statement of the noble lord.

Mr. M. ATTWOOD thought the interest of the mercantile community would be better consulted, by the noble lord's taking off the duty on bills of exchange, than by any of the reductions which he proposed to effect.

Mr. JAMES was very happy to hear that the house tax had been taken off; but he would have been more happy to hear that the malt tax had been taken off. He could not agree with the right hon. baronet, the member for Tamworth, in his depreciation of joint-stock banks; as he believed that they were far safer, and much more useful than private banks; however respectable the individuals who kept them might be.

Sir H. WILLOUGHBY said that the project of the noble Chancellor of the Exchequer went to increase the amount of the funded debt.

Lord ALTHORP denied the charge of the hon. member. The funded debt was not increased a shilling.

Mr. BUCKINGHAM objected to the reduction of the duty on Irish spirits being termed a relief, it was quite the contrary; for by its means the grain was converted into liquid poison, and the health, as well as morals, of the people destroyed. It was absurd to say that the reduction of the price of spirits would decrease their consumption.

Mr. SHAW was of the same opinion.

(FOR CONTINUATION SEE FOURTH PAGE.)

KILKENNY ASSIZES.

County Court—Wednesday. The jury returned a verdict of guilty against the defendant in the case of *People v. [Name]*, for the offence of [Crime].

The court then proceeded to the trial of *People v. [Name]*, where the defendant was found guilty of [Crime].

The court then proceeded to the trial of *People v. [Name]*, where the defendant was found guilty of [Crime].

The court then proceeded to the trial of *People v. [Name]*, where the defendant was found guilty of [Crime].

The court then proceeded to the trial of *People v. [Name]*, where the defendant was found guilty of [Crime].

The court then proceeded to the trial of *People v. [Name]*, where the defendant was found guilty of [Crime].

The court then proceeded to the trial of *People v. [Name]*, where the defendant was found guilty of [Crime].

The court then proceeded to the trial of *People v. [Name]*, where the defendant was found guilty of [Crime].

The court then proceeded to the trial of *People v. [Name]*, where the defendant was found guilty of [Crime].

The court then proceeded to the trial of *People v. [Name]*, where the defendant was found guilty of [Crime].

The court then proceeded to the trial of *People v. [Name]*, where the defendant was found guilty of [Crime].

The court then proceeded to the trial of *People v. [Name]*, where the defendant was found guilty of [Crime].

The court then proceeded to the trial of *People v. [Name]*, where the defendant was found guilty of [Crime].

The court then proceeded to the trial of *People v. [Name]*, where the defendant was found guilty of [Crime].

The court then proceeded to the trial of *People v. [Name]*, where the defendant was found guilty of [Crime].

The court then proceeded to the trial of *People v. [Name]*, where the defendant was found guilty of [Crime].

The court then proceeded to the trial of *People v. [Name]*, where the defendant was found guilty of [Crime].

The court then proceeded to the trial of *People v. [Name]*, where the defendant was found guilty of [Crime].

The court then proceeded to the trial of *People v. [Name]*, where the defendant was found guilty of [Crime].

The court then proceeded to the trial of *People v. [Name]*, where the defendant was found guilty of [Crime].

The court then proceeded to the trial of *People v. [Name]*, where the defendant was found guilty of [Crime].

The court then proceeded to the trial of *People v. [Name]*, where the defendant was found guilty of [Crime].

The court then proceeded to the trial of *People v. [Name]*, where the defendant was found guilty of [Crime].

The court then proceeded to the trial of *People v. [Name]*, where the defendant was found guilty of [Crime].

The court then proceeded to the trial of *People v. [Name]*, where the defendant was found guilty of [Crime].

The court then proceeded to the trial of *People v. [Name]*, where the defendant was found guilty of [Crime].

The court then proceeded to the trial of *People v. [Name]*, where the defendant was found guilty of [Crime].

The court then proceeded to the trial of *People v. [Name]*, where the defendant was found guilty of [Crime].

The court then proceeded to the trial of *People v. [Name]*, where the defendant was found guilty of [Crime].

The court then proceeded to the trial of *People v. [Name]*, where the defendant was found guilty of [Crime].

The court then proceeded to the trial of *People v. [Name]*, where the defendant was found guilty of [Crime].

The court then proceeded to the trial of *People v. [Name]*, where the defendant was found guilty of [Crime].

The court then proceeded to the trial of *People v. [Name]*, where the defendant was found guilty of [Crime].

The court then proceeded to the trial of *People v. [Name]*, where the defendant was found guilty of [Crime].

The court then proceeded to the trial of *People v. [Name]*, where the defendant was found guilty of [Crime].





