**THE BRADLAUGH CASE.**

Yesterday Mr. Bradlaugh and Mr. Besant came up for judgment for having published an obscene book. The Queen's Bench Court was crowded.

After a preliminary objection had been arranged,

Mr. Bradlaugh said he had three motions—one to quash the indictment, another for arrest of judgment, and for a new trial.

The LORD CHIEF JUISTICE (with whom was Mr. Justice Mellor) remarked that that was disposed of, for he declined to quash the Indictment. However, he could argue that as a point of law.

Mr. BRADLAUGH moved to quash the indictment or an arrest of judgment on the ground that indictment was for an obscene libel, and that the words supposed to be criminal ought to be expressly specified in the indictment, in order to support the indictment, the whole of the pamphlet should have been set out ; but if parts of the indictment were sufficient to sustain the charge of obscenity, then those paste should have been set out in the indictment. He asked for a new trial on the ground that the advocacy of checks to population did not constitute a libel within the comma law.

The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE: There are checks consistent with morality, and others not, it is an offence to publish anything which is inconsistent with public morals.

Mrs. BESANT:- resumed the argument.

The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE remarked that the offence was that of publishing such a book as this.

Mrs. BESANT:- containing cheeks which your Lordship said was legitimate inquiry.

The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE: because I agreed that the language of the book was not open to objection. There was nothing of indecency in it, and the details were such that If they had been in a medical work they would not have been open to objection, and you were entitled to argue that it was published as a medical work. When you come to propose checks, then the question is whether it is consistent with public morals, and the jury found that against you.

Mrs. BESANT then urged that the verdict was really a verdict of not guilty against them, and she moved for a new trial, on the ground that the words selected by the Jury were self contradictory and against the weight of evidence, and that when the verdict was finally brought in it was by a misdirection. The jury found that they entirety exonerated the defendants from any corrupt motives in publishing the book. Corrupt intent was charged in the indictment, and having been acquitted of that, she submitted that they were free,

The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE said that one part of an indictment being badly drawn did not vitiate the good parts of the indictment.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL having supported the indictment and Mr. BRADLAUGH having replied,

The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE said a grave offence had been committed by continuing the sale of the book since the trial. But for this the court was prepared to let them go on their own recognisances, but they had set the law at defiance, and the offence now assumed a very grave character. The court sentenced Mr. Bradlaugh and Mrs. Besant to six months' imprisonment and a fine of £200 each, and recognisances in £500 not to sell the book for two years. They were allowed, however, to go on their own recognisances in £100 not to sell the book till the case was determined by the Court of Error. If the judgment is approved then the sentence to stand.