

The Legal News.

VOL. XI. AUGUST 25, 1888. No. 34.

Attempts have been made simultaneously in England, Canada and the United States to obtain exceptional legislation for the protection of newspapers against vexatious suits for libel. The principal demand is that parties suing newspapers should be compelled to give security for costs. There can be no doubt that frivolous actions are frequently instituted against newspaper proprietors who, in the end, have to pay their own costs, it being impossible to collect them from the plaintiffs. But frivolous actions are also brought against other persons, and it is doubtful whether a sufficient case has been established to justify class legislation. In Michigan, the newspapers, to the number of seven hundred, have combined to oppose every candidate for the legislature who will not pledge himself unequivocally to advocate the adoption of amendments to cover the following requisitions: "1. The fact of publication shall not in itself create the presumption of malice. 2. The word 'malice' shall be restricted to its plain, common and obvious meaning, and shall cease to be the cover and ambush of legal fictions. 3. Malice, in the sense of a desire or design to commit injury, shall be proved, or a probable ground for its existence established by evidence, before any question of exemplary damages will lie. 4. When 'malice' is not proved by the plaintiff, no damages other than actual damages shall be assessed. 5. The plaintiff shall give security for costs. 6. Whenever a verdict of acquittal or a verdict for nominal damages is rendered the plaintiff shall pay all costs with attorney fee. 7. No action for libel shall be sustained unless the plaintiff has first made a demand upon the publisher for a correction of the alleged libellous publication. 8. In any action for libel, only actual damages shall be recovered, providing the publication was due to misapprehension of the facts, and the publisher, as soon as possible after learning

of its falsity, makes a full and fair correction." The *Albany Law Journal* opposes these changes vehemently, observing:—"The newspapers are not oppressed. They constitute a tremendous and nearly irresponsible power already, and are calling for more power and greater license. It is like the wolves demanding to have the lambs muzzled. Society is pretty much at the mercy of the zealous young man with pencil and pad, who goes about seeking whom he may devour, with an eager desire to get a start of all rivals, and ingratiate himself with his employer, and with no discretion or inquiry, or even care for reputations or probabilities. The newspaper 'interviewer,' intrusive, impudent, slangy, reckless, lying, is one of the worst pests of modern society. The employer too frequently cares for nothing but to give 'the news' ahead of the other journals and put dollars in his own pocket. The reputation of men, and women too, is at the mercy of these scavengers. So liberal is the law on the subject of privileged statements, and so strict is it in regard to the necessity of proof of malice, that under the guise of criticism or comment on public men and public affairs, the licence of the press has become almost intolerable. We wonder how any man dares run for office in view of the inevitable torrent of filth and falsehood and scandal that is sure to be discharged upon him. Give security for costs, forsooth! Suppose the man abused is poor and can't? It would be much more just to compel every newspaper to give general security not to libel." Given a state of things as bad as our contemporary depicts, which however we think is far from being generally true, greater evils would flow from exceptional privileges than from allowing the law to remain as it is.

In *Commonwealth v. Turner*, the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts have given a decision of interest to certain classes of sportsmen. The Court held that letting loose a captive fox to be hunted by dogs is punishable under the Public Statutes of Massachusetts, c. 207, s. 53, which provides for the punishment of any person who, hav-