THE CONVICTION OF MR. BRADLAUGH AND MRS. BESANT.

The Lord Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Mellor had before them yesterday, in the Queen’s Bench Division, the case of The Queen v. Bradlaugh and Besant. The defendants had obtained a rule calling upon the prosecution to show cause why the judgment roll hearis should not be completed by inserting the actual data when the interlocutory judgment was signed on the postea, and why the time for the defendants to transcribe the said judgment roll should not be enlarged, and why any further proceedings should not be stayed in the meantime. The Solicitor-General, with whom was Mr. Mead showed cause against the rule. He was not aware of any precedent for the application which the rule involved. The judgment in this case was in its form regular, and was recorded judgment. Their Lordships had absolute power over all judgments in their Court, and it would therefore, be rash to say that they had repower to alter a recorded judgment. This was the first time that an effort had been made to make an alteration in a recorded judgment. - Mrs. Besant and Mr. Bradlaugh urged that had been an informality is not signing the rule to arrest judgment, and that before they could proceed farther on writ of error it was necessary that the record should be corrected. The arguments were peculiarly technical, - The Court held that the proceedings were regular, and discharged this rule with costs.