**TRIAL OF MR. C. BRADLAUGH AND MRS. BESANT.**

**THE VERDICT.**

The hearing of this case was resumed yesterday morning. Mrs. BESANT proceed to sum up the case for the defence. She again argued that the language employed in the pamphlet was not at all beyond what was allow-able in medical works, and in fact in Fullness of expression fell far abort of what was found in ordinary books of that nature, and which were circulated In girl’s schools. The question was, in fact, narrowed down to this—whether the book was to be considered a medical work or not. She held that there could be no doubt of that, and that its language was most moderate, and calculated as Little as anything procedbly could be to deprave the minds. of those who read it. Further, it was argued that an intention to deprave was shown by the cheap rate at which the book was sold. She failed to see, inasmuch as there had been no endeavour to check the sale, that the cheapness of the book had anything to do with its morality or otherwise, especially as they found that there was no restriction on this sale of high. Priced medical works.

Mr. Bradlaugh having reviewed the case,

The SOLICITOR-GENERAL addressed the jury in reply,

He said that the book was a dirty, filthy book, which no decently trained man would allow his wife to read he denied that the defendants had the right to circulate such a book, the object of which, he held was clearly to enable person to have sexual intercourse without the consequences which generally followed. The Jury were to say whether, looking at the book as a whole, it was to be considered obscene and calculated to deprave public morals.

The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE then proceeded to sum up, and at the outset regretted that so much publicity should have been given to a publication which had continued obscure for so many years. He did not know who the prosecutors were, but he very much, regretted the course which had been taken, and which had resulted in such a large and indiscriminate sale of the pamphlet. He expressed his belief that the defendants had no desire to corrupt, but It was for the Jury to consider whether, though they might not Intend It, what was contained In the book was calculated to corrupt. He did not believe Dr Knowlton had any but good intentions when he published the work. The learned Chief Justice put It that he agreed with the Solicitor general In this, that even If the defendants had the best intentions in publishing the work they were responsible if any harm was held to be done but it. Further, whatever was the law of the land, all persons in this country must abide by it, and it was not sufficient a person to say that because a law was a bad law And inconsistent with perfect freedom of discussion, that it should be defied. No matter what the Intention of publishing this book might be, the question really was —what was the effect of the contents? Had the defendants in this instance published details which were inconsistent with decency, and calculated to incite dealers? If anything was advocated In the book which was inconsistent with the morals of society, then the defendants would be guilty. If they did not think so the defendants. Were entitled to acquittal, and it must not be forgotten that It was for the prosecution to make out their case. In the course of his remark, the Lord Chief Justice said: A more ill-advised, injudicious prosecution was never brought into a court of justice. When the Solicitor-General said the authorities were compelled to prosecute he should like to know who the authorities were. The policeman seemed to be the prosecutor. So long as the Government thought fit to leave the administration of justice without a public prosecutor, so long very individual, however ill-advised, had a right to put the law in motion. he put it to the jury, Was the purpose advocated in the work and the purpose for which the details were given Inconsistent with public morals? If the jury considered the offence made out, no conviction that the defendants had acted from a sense of public duty and a desire to do a public good could justify that which was wrong The Lord Chief Justice then went on to deal in detail with the case as presented, his summing up being decidedly in favour of the defendants.

The Jury, after being absent an hour and a half, returned, and in answer to the Associate said they were of opinion that the book was calculated to deprave the public morals, but they entirely exonerated the defendants. from any corrupt motive publishing it.

The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE said he must direct them upon that to find the verdict against the defendants, inasmuch as he had already ruled that If the book (UN READ ABLE TEXT) the Character they had given it, the publishers were responsible, whatever their motives might have been. Their exoneration from any corrupt intention would be fully taken into consideration hereafter, but he must direct them that upon their finding a verdict of guilty must be returned.

The Jury thereupon formally returned a verdict of guilty, and

The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE then intimated that he should give judgment that day week end then, in the court sitting In (UNRADABLE TEXT) Mr. Bradlaugh would have an opportunity of arguing those points which had been reserved.

Mr. BRADLAUGH asked whether they should go at large on the same recognisances as before, and the LORD CHIEF JUSTIC said, “Most certainly”

The Jury on leaving the box were hissed by those in court, and the defendants were cheered in Westminster Hall, and left in a carriage and pair.