article stated that the police authorities were in search of Mrs. Beaton, alias Mrs Oliver, to arrest her for the murder of Cicero Harrison Case

This story was published by a large number of papers throughout the country, and as a result, about a dozen writs claiming damages for libel were issued at the instance of Mrs. Beaton, of Burlington Among these was that against the St Thomas Journal, owned and edited by Mr J S Brierley

After several adjournments the case came up for trial at the assizes here

The plaintiff, Mrs Beaton, was in court, but was not put in the box The fact may partly account for the smallness of the verdict, for it is very hard, as all lawyers know, to recover heavy damages for libel without the testimony of the person principally interested The only witness was the defendant, Mr Brierley. He explained that his evening paper used stereotype plate matter sent from Toronto, and that on August 4, 1893, the plates contained the Beaton story, which he published, together with a portion of an addition to the story from the Toronto World. He had published this without malice, and was not in a position to verify the truth of the story. A few days later he had published an item, which also came in the plate matter, to the effect that the story rested on a very slight foundation After receiving notice of the intended libel suit against him, Mr Brierley said he had published a retraction, which he read to the court Mr Brierley further showed that his paper had a very slight circulation in the district around Burlington where Mrs Beaton was likely to be known. This was all the evidence put in, and Editor Brierley then addressed the jury on his own behalf So ably did Mr. Brierley handle his case that the judge in his charge to the jury remarked that a clever lawyer had been lost to the bar when Mr. Brierley took up the profession of journalism. The editor stated his belief that this suit had been begun more with a desire to obtain money than a vindication of character. If this had not been the case, he said, the plaintiff would have taken the witness box and told her own story Mr Brierley then launched into a forcible arraignment of the libel law of Ontario. That law, he said, had been framed when the scope of a newspaper was much more limited than it is at present He did not ask license for papers, but they should not be held responsible for what they had not originated, nor for items taken from exchanges which were supposed to be responsible sources of information, it being difficult, if not wholly impossible to verify such items Mr Brierley, in the course of his address, rapped the fingers of those lawyers who took hold of libel suits in the hope of inducing the newspaper to settle for costs The plaintiff's counsel, Mr. G Lynch Staunton, charged Mr Brierley with playing a part in appearing in his own behalf This was a new trick in this country, he said, but one frequently practiced by Labouchere, "the prince of libelers The newspapers of Ontario had all the liberty they should have, and in a case of this kind it should be Pay or prove The judge's charge to the jury inclined in favor of the defendant, principally on the ground that there was no malice and that verification of the story was well nigh impossible. He, however, strongly deprecated the practice of newspapers in publishing sensational articles simply to get ahead of an opposition paper.

The jury retired at 10 p.m., and, after an adjournment for the night, brought in a verdict at about noon the next day. It awarded the plaintiff $1 in addition to the $10 Mr. Brierley had already paid into court But this verdict was sufficient to carry costs, and the judge refused the editor's plea to use his discretion in awarding the costs in view of the apology made to the plaintiff. So Mr. Brierley will have to pay between $200 and $300 for the publication of the "Beaton case."

The verdict of the jury, however, indicates one very important fact It is that the sympathy in a libel suit where there exists no malice on the part of the defendant, and where the plaintiff does not go into the box to show actual damage to his reputation, is liable to be with the newspaper. And if this be the case, to such an extent that the individuals who begin such actions are not able to recover substantial damages, it will not be long before the libel law is so changed as to render such prosecutions as Beaton vs. Brierly impossible. For the public opinion as expressed in a verdict such as that in the above named case will soon chrystalize itself in the form of a legislative enactment.

HEAD VS. SPECTATOR.

This was a case in which Mr. Thomas Head, of Copetown, claimed $5,000 damages from the Hamilton Spectator for publishing a clipping from the Toronto Globe, saying that Mr. Head, a well-to-do former butcher of Copetown, had been arrested and arraigned at the Police Court in Simcoe on a charge of obtaining $150 from Mr. John D. McIntosh by false pretences. The paragraph went on to state that in December, 1876, Head had sold to McIntosh the right to sell a patented machine in the County of Norfolk for $400, of which $150 was paid in cash and the balance to be paid in royalties. McIntosh had discovered that Head had previously sold a portion of the territory to another man. Head was allowed to go on his own recognizance and was subsequently acquitted. The plaintiff objected to the article because he said it suppressed certain portions of the evidence at the trial favorable to him, and also because it was headed "Tom Head in trouble at Simcoe." He also alleged to be libellous a statement added to the report of the trial to the effect that the prosecution was said to have evidence in reserve that would bear very strongly against the defendant. The Spectator published a retraction and apology, and an account of Mr. Head's acquittal at Simcoe. It was shown in evidence that Head had agreed to settle first for $500, then for $100, and finally he came down to $25. The Spectator then refused to pay him anything.

In his charge to the jury, Mr. Justice Falconbridge explained that reports of judicial proceedings were privileged. If this was a fair report of Head's trial then a verdict must be found for the newspaper. Again, the statement about the evidence in reserve was strictly true, for it had, as a matter of fact, been said at the trial that such evidence existed, and would be likely to secure a conviction. The judge further explained to the jury that an apology was a sufficient answer to an action for libel in the case of a public newspaper, where there was no malice or gross negligence But it was no defence to say that the information on which the libel suit was based came from a reputable source The charge of His Lordship was strongly in favor of