

Witnesses were called to prove that Mr. Ward, while conducting, in Halifax, the *Free Press*—a publication of the twenties—was inclined to be quarrelsome and had become involved in several angry disputes. This evidence amounted to very little, and was taken no notice of by the court. As the plea was "not guilty" the defence of justification was not made.

The solicitor general addressed the court in no mincing words. The case had assumed a more serious aspect, he said, than when opened by the counsel for the defence arguing that the intention of parties was of consequence in alleged libels. The libel was a violent slander. It was not such a reply as an aggrieved party should have been allowed to publish. Persons might give opinions of others, without fear of legal consequences, as for example, when they were legally acting—such as a person giving a character of a servant, a relative or a commercial correspondent, stating opinions of a third party, a reporter furnishing proceedings of the house of parliament or courts of law. The case before the court was different. The publication of a libel by the plaintiff by no means privileged the defendants to publish another. It would have been an insult to plaintiff to have laid special damages. Who doubted that a man would be damaged in his feelings and family and daily avocation by such charges going abroad in a widely circulated paper?

The chief justice charged against the defendants in an address of considerable length. The jury (special) brought in a verdict for the plaintiff, awarding the damages at £40, with expenses. The defendants, on their part, lashed the solicitor general with great fury. So far as the latter was concerned it took the printers several years to recover their equanimity in criticising his public conduct.

Mr. Doyle's law office was on Granville Street, at Cleveland's corner (Sackville and Granville streets, northeast cor-