THE KING'S HONOUR.

A CRIMINAL LIBEL ON THE SOVEREIGN.

VERDICT AND SENTENCE.

The defendant, Edward F. Mylius, was charged on the information of the Attorney-General with having published a libel of and concerning the King. The libel had appeared in a Republican leaflet or paper known as the Liberator, which was printed in Paris. The hearing of the case aroused much interest, and the Court was crowded. Among those who attended were the Home Secretary (Mr. Winston Churchill) and the Director of Public Prosecutions (Sir Charles' Mathews).

The Attorney-General (Sir Rufus Isaacs, K.C.), the Solicitor-General (Sir J. Simon, K.C.), Mr. R. D. Muir, and Mr. S. A. T. Rowlatt appeared to prosecute; the defendant, a small dark man of youthful appearance, was not defended by counsel. He sat in one of the seats allotted to solicitors.

APPLICATIONS BY THE DEFENDANT.

After the jury had entered the box, but before they had been sworn, the Lord Chief Justice remarked that the defendant had certain rights under the Criminal Appeal Act. Accordingly he gave instructions for a shorthand note of the proceedings to be taken. The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE then informed the de-

fendant that, although he had no rights in the matter. if there was any member of the jury to whom he objected the juror so objected to should leave the The defendant.—I desire to make application

for the immediate restoration of my private letters, the seizure of which on December 26 was in gross violation of the law. The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE.—That does not arise

now. That is not a matter for my consideration. I cannot make any order now. The defendant.—Before the jury are sworn I wish to ask if the King is present.

The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE.—What do you say? The defendant.—I wish to ask if the prosecutor is present here, and I demand his presence, on the grounds, first, that every accused person has a right to be confronted with his accuser in Court; secondly, that no action for libel is usually taken without the prosecutor being in Court, where the jury can see him; and thirdly, that there is no proof that the

prosecutor is at present alive. The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE.—This has already been the subject of an application before me. You are perfectly well aware that the King cannot be summoned here. The King is not present.

The defendant.—I wish to take exception to your! Lordship's ruling. names of the jury called. Do you object to any one? | short passage as offensive as it can be made:---

The defendant.---I wish to ask each juryman whether he is able to render a fair and impartial verdict upon the evidence.

The Lord Chief Justice.—That is not a proper question. The jury were then sworn.

THE CHARGES AGAINST THE DEFENDANT.

Mr. Rowlatt said that the information charged that the defendant p blished a libel of and concerning his Majesty the King on November 29, 1910; a second count charged a second publication of the same libel on December 19, and a third count charged the publication of another libel on December 19. The defendant by his plea admitted posting the alleged libe? at Notting-hill Post Office, and said that the alleged ! public interest.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL, in his opening statement. said:—This case, as indicated to you by my friend Mr. Rowlatt, is brought upon an information filed by me in

ber and December, called the Liberator, a journal journals in this country. which is devoted to the spread of Republican ideas | THE DEFENDANT AND THE "LIBERATOR," I think the exact words used in the document itself are :-- "An international journal devoted to the extension of the Republic." And it may be that in the course of some letters which I shall have to read you during this trial you will find expressions here and there in parts of what I may read to you which are intended to promote Republican ideas and are aimed against the Monarchy. I am very anxious that you should understand from the outset that in these in reading, as I speak of Mr. Aldred." proceedings and in this prosecution no complaint has and views which this gentleman and those associated this leaflet.

THE KING'S MARRIAGE.

The suggestion which is made, and the statement deliberately made by this defendant with some knowledge of the responsibility which attaches to a person who chooses to make such a statement, that the King. Act, so that there might be a valid marriage, and did in an earlier year, and, I suppose, the offspring which it was said that she had borne-to abandon them |, "foully" in order that he might contract this bigamous marriage with the present Queen.

THE ALLEGED I BEL.

before I read it, that there are three counts in this insert them in the next Liberator. You are extremely You will observe the importance of that date. It

British Navy. Of this marriage offspring were

heirs to the English Throne.

I have always understood that the King is above the law and can do no wrong. He may commit murder, rape, arson, or any other crime, yet the law cannot try him. The only way he can be dealt with in this country is by revolution. No one can properly speak of the King acting legally or illegally. We only speak of him acting unconstitutionally or otherwise. It seems to me, therefore, that your article must be directed at the so-called British Constitution, which allows and tolerates a bigamous King to rule over the Empire. The law is not made for the King, but supposedly by the King for his subjects and slaves.

While I have this matter before me I will read The Lord Chief Justice.—You have heard the the publication of December which contains one

The Daily News of London informs us that the King plans to visit India with his wife. Would the newspaper kindly tell us which wife?

THE LIBEL DENIED.

Now before I proceed further in detailing to you the real facts with regard to this libel, let me you at once, as of course you will expect to hear, that there is not the faintest vestige of truth in any of these statements—that the only statemen' which is true in the whole of those words which read to you, published by this man, is the statement that his Majesty the King in 1893 married the lady who is now her Majesty the Queen. Beyond that the whole story from beginning to end is tissue of untruths for which, as I have said, there' libels were true and that their publication was for the is not even a shadow or vestige of any foundation. I shall have the opportunity of detailing to you facts which prove beyond any question, beyond any possibility of doubt, the absolute falsity of every one of those statements.

my official capacity as Attorney-General for a libel one further fact, and that is this, that the defendant tunately will not arise on account of the evidence defendant who is before you chose—to disregard the published by the defendant Edward F. Mylius, upon who is before you and who has admitted the posting which we shall put before you. Gentlemen, if a man statement, which he was quite entitled to do if he his Majesty the King—a libel which I have no doubt, of these leaflets, which is the publication alleged chooses to make false, malicious, and defamatory had reliable information upon which he could base are not forgotten. Ever yours, E. H. James." when you hear it read, as you will in a moment or against him, is not a mere conduit-pipe for distri- statements of you or me, we can institute proceedings his statement. He was quite entitled to say that, two, you will be of opinion is a libel of a gross and buting these leaslets. He is not a person in the and have the advantage of going into the witness- "although there is this statement by Sir Arthur serious character; a libel which reflected on the King, position of some one who receives a parcel containing box, and giving evidence on oath before the Bigge in the newspapers, and although it is said Received your letter of October 30 with clipping. attacked him in his honour, reflects upon him and is the Liberator copies and then distributes them Judge and jury, and of refuting from the witness- quite clearly that the King never married any one Regard statement made by Bigge as tending to conintended to reflect upon him so as to lower him in the according to order. He is the responsible person box the calumnies which have been spread before he married the present Queen, yet I have firm our case. Let them make more complete exesteem and respect of honourable and right-minded in this country for the publication and distribution and circulated of us. But that is not quite information in my possession, I have evidence before planations." citizens. The information which I have filed is in of this leaslet; he is the person who is in active the position of his Majesty the King. According me, I have material here, which shows me that this accordance with the procedure which is appropriate communication with James, who, according to to the view of the law which my learned friend statement is not true." If he had, now is the opporaccording to the practice and the precedents of this letters which we have, is an American residing in and colleague, the Solicitor-General, and I take, tunity to produce it before you, so that you may Court for a libel of this character. And it has this Paris. This man James appears to be a man of after, I need scarcely say, very careful research and judge of it. From the correspondence it looks which he referred to and which he referred to an an of the correspondence it looks which he referred to an an of the correspondenc advantage, that it has enabled the defendant to some means, to have had this paper printed in Paris, consideration, the Sovereign has not the advantage as if there was no information, but that it plea of justification:—"Received your articles of No. 18. The name of that messenger was Shipman. be brought before you at an earlier date, inasmuch as and to have come into communication with the possessed by every subject of the Realm—namely, was thought that this was too useful a weapon October 30 with clipping." The clipping apparently I was only three or four yards away and the messenger the proceedings were only started on December 26, defendant Mylius, who was then living in London, the right to vindicate his character by refuting on to wield against the Monarchy for it to be must be from Reynolds's Newspaper, which is referred delivered the same parcel as I had previously seen and notwithstanding an application for some further through a man named Krishnavarma, an Indian, oath before a Judge and jury any libellous statement abandoned, however authentic, and however plain, to by the defendant, and which is under date of at Newhaven. time made on his behalf and granted by the Judge, living in Paris also, who apparently brought made against him, for, by virtue of the King's position, clear, and definite the contradiction was. It was October 30, the day apparently when the defendant the matter comes before you for trial to-day, within these two persons together. You will find from of his sovereignty under our Constitution, and apart thought, apparently, that this was a means of hitting wrote to James. something like five weeks of the commencement of these letters which I am going to read to you— altogether from the narrow technical legal difficulties, at the Monarchy which they must not abandon. letters which were found at the defendant's lodgings he cannot go into the witness-box to testify in person | The consequence was that these publications were | Reynolds's Newspaper of October 30, 1910:— At the outset of the case I want to tell you that this | when he was arrested-that they will show quite libel is contained in the leaflets, published in Novem- plainly that he is the active distributor of these

On January 19, 1910, James writes from Paris to the defendant, Mr. E. Mylius, 18, Courtnell-street, Bayswater, London:-

"Dear Sir, Your name has been given to me by Mr. Krishnavarma as being an intimate friend of Mr. Guy Aldred. I send you a little leaflet which have published, and which you may be interested

That is the first communication. Then been lodged because of the Republican sentiments February 13 again James writes to the defendant:---"I have received and enjoyed your letter of the evidence beyond all possibility of a doubt the falsity this in mind in the consideration of this matter with him in this leastet may choose to advocate. A 10th instant "—so you see they are in correspondence government for this country. He is probably freer. a little monthly paper called the Liberator, similar and for the accused. It is not necessary that I should | Liberator. This (letter) is on October 24 and the in this country than in any country in the world to Mr. Krishnavarma's paper, the first number of do more, at any rate at the present moment, in dealing first publication, which is alleged, by this defendant, publish his views and to circulate them; and so long which will be out in about a week. I shall send with this matter than to say this to you—that the is, as I have indicated to you, November 29. Therebroad and generous lines, no complaint is made tional journal devoted to the extension of the Re- will give you their statements, statements directly publication:against him, however much you and I may differ public.' I cannot tell just exactly where such a relevant to the matters which are in issue, will be from every sentiment which is expressed in that programme may lead, but it seemed to me that such sufficient to show how utterly groundless this accusapaper. But I want you quite clearly to appreciate an object was at least something definite. In several tion which the defendant has made and has persisted that this presecution is not in respect of any observa- of the European countries, such as Spain, Portugal, in is. tions of that character which may have been made in and Belgium, there are rather active Republican parties, more or less affiliated with Socialists, and it

1890, while in Malta, married a daughter of an admiral, Liberators which I sent. If you can send me a short can call before you Admiral Sir Michael Culme- say." that at that time he was not the Heir to the Throne, article, stating your views with regard to a Republican Seymour and his daughter, who is, as the defendant I will make this observation. That at that time get at the truth." but that within a short period, namely, in 1892, as Government in England and the best methods to be has asserted, still living, who is a married lady, the defendant knew as much about it as James, and I cannot help observing that all this was a little late,

dated May 2:---

information—in other words, that there are three kind to do so much to popularize the Liberator." is some months after the present King had married definite and distinct charges. The first is for publica- Now, gentlemen, those are letters which I have read the present Queen. Never at any time was the

was Heir to the Throne. Subsequently the Duke as Lord Campbell's Act for him to have said that what I have read to you. of Clarence died, leaving the present King Heir he has asserted is true, and, moreover, that it was to the Throne. It is now that we are offered the for the public benefit that he should publish it. spectacle of the immorality of the Monarchy in Now, gentlemen, the defendant, you will see by that, obtain the woman of Royal blood for his pretended | could not otherwise have been open to him, so that his Majesty the King had contracted what is called a material to the present inquiry. secret or morganatic marriage with the daughter of Sir Michael Culme-Seymour, with children by it, and had stated, "That is absolutely, root and branch. an untruth." He says, fourthly, that it is important for the public welfare of the people of England that they should know who is the true and lawful wife of his Majesty the King. And apparently. to learn that from a sheet which is published in Paris, Private Secretaries, and he will be called before you. by post a smaller bundle. . . . The English that the protection of this Court has been sought which he dare not print and publish here, and which It is quite plain, of course, from a statement made is circulated throughout England by this defendant, that there did appear in a newspaper of October 30, Edward Mylius. As my friend, the Solicitor-General, 1910, a most emphatic denial given by Sir Arthur chosen to place upon the record that plea; the burden | quite plainly from the correspondence and the plea, | not Heir to the Throne when he married the first | Your protection is sought for the honour of the him—what basis there was for this statement which statements which I have already indicated to you. have here an opportunity to make a formidable he circulated in November and December, and what I will say no more about that publication at the with leaving the matter there. We do not intend to statement of the King. wait until the defendant has given some evidence in support of his plea, as we should be quite entitled to do according to all the rules in this Court; but we shall at once, at the earliest opportunity afforded passed at this time it will also become apparent, as

> THE KING'S INCAPACITY TO GIVE EVIDENCE. stitution for reasons of public policy. And I further some scandal about those who live in high places. say this, which will not surprise you, that there has never been any precedent for the calling of the King of this country into the witness-box to testify on oath. inflict hardship upon the Sovereign. But fortunately get the history of how these letters came to be written. in this case—although no doubt in the result a little | so far as it is known to us. on more labour and a little more time has to be spent One letter I must read, although it is a little out of upon the evidence—we are able to establish from other | its order, because it is very important you should bear

and repeat in the justification on the record.

THE ALLEGATIONS. plained of in this information. I should tell you, shall cull some sentences from it (your letter) and end of October or the beginning of November, 1893. when this November eaflet was published.

; is a further charge of publishing on December 19 the | which this defendant occupied in reference to the | was there. Except from 1886 to 1888 he was not | written, and from whom the information was to be | Then, on November 15, Krishnavarma writes to the same leastet; and also, in the third count, there is a Liberator and Mr. James, the proprietor. Let me there until some considerable time after his marriage obtained. Apparently James writes on August 3 defendant Myllus direct. He says:—"I thank charge of publishing another leaset, also the now point out to you that the charge which is made to the present Queen. The ladies of the Seymour to Myling another leaset, also the now point out to your instructions Liberator, on December 19. This leasest (holding against this defendant is not one of publishing a family never went to Malta until five months after ... Wylins, --Your letter of July 31st is at regarding the Liberator will be duly carried out." it up to the jury) is called. The Liberator, an inter- seditions libel. That, of course, is a well-known the marriage of the King to the Queen, and never hand. I have sent you, I think, four rolls of paper, So that you will see at that date from these things national journal devoted to the extension of the offence in this country. And had he been charged met the King at any time in Malta. He never was and will send you snother to-day, so that you will have and from what happened afterwards that the defen-Republic, Volume I., No. 9, Paris, November, 1910." with that offence the defendant could not have set there during the whole time that they were there, about 100 copies. If you want more I will let you dant had given the instructions to Krishnavarma You will observe before I read the libel to you that up in answer to the charge that the statements which and in point of fact the one lady, the lady who dien have them. . . I am glad that you are pleased apparently by letter on the 13th, that he was to send the Liberator is not printed in this country, and, he had made and which were complained of were true. in 1895, had never met the King to speak to him in with the August " Lib." I do not know that I shall on some more of these papers. You will hear quite of course, for a very good reason. Those who desired It is no snawer in a charge of seditions libel for a her life. She had seen him, no doubt, but she had be able to keep up with the same high standard. plainly from the evidence that defendant received two to circulate these statements had taken care to have defendant to say, "What I have said is true." It is a never spoken to him during the whole of her exist- That is one reason why I want to discover and en- lots and circulated them both in November and in them printed in Paris, whence they were despatched defence which is not open to him—for reasons which ence. Mrs. Napier, the lady who is the lady courage new talent. If you know anybody with December, that is the publication made with reference The case of The King versus E. F. Mylius was to this country to the defendant Mylius, and by him I need not discuss before you but which from a apparently with reference to whom this charge is ideas urge them to get into communication with me. to this marriage in the issue of the Liberator of were posted, circulated, and distributed throughout very little apprehension of the meaning of seditions made, had seen him twice before he sailed for Male Without a doubt they will have something to say November 29, to which I have called your attention. opened and concluded yesterday in the King's the country. It is stated to be published monthly libel must be apparent to everybody. In this case, at the end of October or beginning of November, worth printing. Bench Division of the High Court of Justice by Edward Holden James, 20, Rue St. Dominique, gentlemen, the charge which is made, and deliberately 1893—once when she was eight years old, and another James writes to Myllus on August 5:—" Can you going to trouble you at present, and all the letters before the Lord Chief Justice and a Special Paris. The libel is headed "Sanctified Bigamy," made, against him has left open, and purposely left time when she was at a reception at Lord Spencer's let me know as much as you know, or can you find to which it is necessary that I should refer, at any rate open, to him the opportunity of setting up the defence in February, 1893, when she did not have an opportunity of setting up the defence in February, 1893, when she did not have an opportunity of setting up the defence in February, 1893, when she did not have an opportunity of setting up the defence in February, 1893, when she did not have an opportunity of setting up the defence in February, 1893, when she did not have an opportunity of setting up the defence in February, 1893, when she did not have an opportunity of setting up the defence in February, 1893, when she did not have an opportunity of setting up the defence in February, 1893, when she did not have an opportunity of setting up the defence in February, 1893, when she did not have an opportunity of setting up the defence in February, 1893, when she did not have an opportunity of setting up the defence in February, 1893, when she did not have an opportunity of setting up the defence in February, 1893, when she did not have an opportunity of setting up the defence in February, 1893, when she did not have an opportunity of setting up the defence in February, 1893, when she did not have an opportunity of setting up the defence in February, 1893, when she did not have an opportunity of setting up the defence in February, 1893, when she did not have an opportunity of setting up the defence in February, 1893, when she did not have an opportunity of setting up the defence in February, 1893, when she did not have an opportunity of setting up the defence in February, 1893, when she did not have an opportunity of setting up the defence in February, 1893, when she did not have an opportunity of setting up the defence in February, 1893, when she did not have an opportunity of setting up the defence in February, 1893, when she did not have an opportunity of setting up the defence in February and the setting up the defence in February and the setting up the defence in February and the setting up the settin During the year 1890, in the island of Malta, that what he has said is true if he chose to take upon tunity of speaking to him, though she was at the Duke of York he married the daughter of a civilian, if it becomes necessary we may have to refer to others. the man who is now the King of England was himself the responsibility of saying, "I have such a reception which he attended. She only spoke to some general's daughter, I believe. When the then But you will observe from what I have read that, in united in lawful holy wedlock with the daughter defence."

him, therefore, once in her life before she went to Duke of Clarence died (who was the direct helr), splite of those letters, and in spite of the failure of this THE PLEA OF JUSTISIOATION.

Malta, and only once in her life before the King George became direct Heir to the Throne, and he man to get any information to support his story, and The charge against him is of publishing a libel, married the Queen. And that is a lady with regard put away his then wife in order to marry a Royal in spite of the fact that he knew there had been this born. At the time of that marriage the Duke of as distinguished from a seditious libel, and in answer to whom this defendant makes the charge and has person." Clarence, the eldest brother of the present King, to that it is a defence under a statute well-known chosen to set up on the record the statement which

THE MALTESE MARRIAGE REGISTERS.

In order not only that this defendant's statements all its sickening, beastly monstrosity. In order to has had an opportunity afforded to him, which may be absolutely refuted, but that an end may be the truth were known we would discover that the You will have observed that the defendant, made of rumours which have been circulated vaguely wife George Frederick foully abandoned his true he might, if he could, establish before you that there and indefinitely—only published with denials in put away his first wife in order to marry the present full knowledge of the contents, that he wife, the daughter of Sir Michael Culme-Seymour, had been such a marriage as he had dared to assert. newspapers until the defendant chose to circulate of the British Navy, and entered into a sham and In this case he has taken upon himself to set up this leaflet, the Liberator—in order to show how shameful marriage with the daughter of the Duke pleas, as it is known in the law, of justification, and ridiculous and how absurd these statements are mum. If we could get at the facts we could get written, and that he was aware, at any rate, that they The said George Frederick not having obtained that the King contracted this marriage in 1890 at that we may present the evidence to you, but to Liberator." On October 8 there is another letter, the purpose of supporting this story. He must any divorce from his first wife, who, by the common | Malta I will read to you-because it is important that | afford the defendant an opportunity, of which he law of England and by the law of the Christian you should know at an early stage—what the defence might not, perhaps, in his position, have been able Church, remained, and, if she lives, remains, his is which he is asserting in this Court. He says this—to avail himself, of searching the registers of marriage Seymour and his family. This is a letter in answer to and serious libel. He was aware from what James true wife, committed the crime of bigamy, and he admits posting at Notting-hill Post Office copies in the Island of Malta. They are brought here by he committed it with the aid and complicity of of the Liberator containing the alleged libels, and he the Crown Advocate of Malta, who will go into the the prelates of the Anglican Church. This is the says that the alleged libels are true in this—that in witness-box and tell you that he has made search to the King's marriage to the daughter of Sir Michael the British people for their King. He was aware sickening and disgusting crime which has been 1890, at Malta, his Majesty the King lawfully married throughout those registers, and that not only is Culme-Seymour, you say that this first marriage that the intention of James, and of Krishnavarma, committed by the English Church; which has the daughter of Sir Michael Culmo-Seymour; that there no record of such a marriage as is alleged, but was 'not recognized by the law of England as the who sends the libeis over to him, and of himself, married one man to two women. Our very thereafter, on July 6, 1893, his Majesty bigamously that, so far as the most careful and diligent search Royal assent was not obtained. This is not quite the defendant, was that he should, by circulating Christian King, the Defender of the Faith, has a married her Majesty the Queen; and as to the third has been able to show, there is no record of any clear to me. I supposed that by the Common Law them, cut away, as the phrase is in the letter, the plurality of wives, just like any Mahomedan count, that the said daughter of Sir Michael Culmemarriage of any person with a lady of the name of and by the Ecclesiastical Law of England when a respect which the people of England now pay to Sultan, and they are sanctified by the English Seymour is, according to the defendant's belief, still Seymour in those registers. Further than that, you marriage has been legally celebrated it took a divorce their King. He knew that the rumour which had Church. The daughter of Sir Michael Culme- alive. And the defendant says that it was for the will have evidence of the Admiralty records, of the Seymour, if she still lives, is by the unchangeable public benefit that the alleged libels should be written registers and log-books of the vessels upon which law of the Christian Church, as well as by the because, first, in divers newspapers it has been stated his Majesty was serving, and they will establish what England. In other words, if a son of an English it, they circulated it, and they used it for their own common law of England, the rightful Queen of that the said daughter of Sir Michael Culme-Seymour I have already indicated to you. In 1886, 1887, King or Queen marries without his parents' consent pursuits, alleging, as is plain from the libel, that the England, and her children are the only rightful was not the true and lawful wife of his Majesty the and 1888 he was serving in one or other of her is not the marriage recognized by the English Courts, man who stood at the head of this country—that King; and, secondly, that Sir Arthur Bigge had caused Majesty's ships—as they then were—and that he In discussing this matter by letter with our to be published in Remolds's Newspaper a statement visited at various times with his ships the island of as legitimate? When I get back to Paris I will had been faise to the Church, false to the lady with valued and steadfast friend Edward F. Mylius, of affirming that his Majesty the King had never married Malta; but that from 1888 the vessels upon which look up this matter in Blackstone." (A laugh.) whom he had gone through the ceremony of marriage, London, we have received from him the following any other person than her Majesty the Queen; and he served were not in Malta, and he was not in Malta "The fact that the first wife was not of Royal blood and false to the children who were born of that that in the Review of Reviews the Dean of Norwich until a considerable time after the date of his marriage had denied the accusation that prior to his marriage to the Queen, and they are therefore quite im- render null a marriage contracted with the King's

> A DEPAMATORY INTENT. Further, you will have noticed the reference which was made by this defendant to Sir Arthur Bigge. He refers to him in his plea as "one Arthur Bigge purporting to be Private Secretary of the King." according to this defendant, the people of England are | seeing Sir Arthur Bigge, who is one of his Majesty's reminds me, he has further said this, "This the Bigge as to rumours which had been circulated of Heirs to the Throne with commoners had not been James or of the defendant Mylius. But the prodefendant stands ready to prove." Now he has made | about this alleged previous marriage. Yet, apparently that assertion upon the file of this Court. He has the defendant, with knowledge of that, as appears f establishing it is upon him, and at some stage, after that date of October 30 and after he knew the I suppose, we shall know what material he had before | denial was made by Sir Arthur Bigge, published these truth there is in the statement which he has made moment. He chose to take upon himself the risk now, that he stands ready to prove it. But, gentled of publishing these statements—the risk which men, although of course beyond all question in law | James, writing from Paris, had referred to. He the burden of proof is upon him, we are not content knew perfectly well that he was publishing a libellous framing an article on this subject."

THE CONTRADICTION.

us—an opportunity, I may say, we welcome—call I submit, that he knew, as James knew who was evidence before you which will utterly refute these writing to him (defendant), that the inquiry which statements which he has chosen to make and circulate | they had made into this rumour had failed to give them any satisfaction or to afford any evidence in support of their statement, and that the result of say." At the end of it are these words :-- "I apprethe inquiry was only this—quite clearly to show ciste more than I can say the time which you devote Now let me also explain to you a little of the diffi- that there was no truth in it. They did not desire, to writing to me, considering that your hours of work But before I do so I would just like to make plain culty that might have arisen in this case, but for- of course, to accept those denials. They chose—this are so long elsewhere. Krishnavarma was here two and on oath in a Court of Justice. And, moreover, made, as I have indicated to you, after there had been gentlemen, he cannot do so however much he may denials known to them, of the truth of letter has been forwarded by Sir Arthur Bigge, Private Goods Station of the London, Brighton, and South wish it, because this is not a private privilege which the rumours which were, so far, merely rumours Secretary to his Majesty the King, to the Rev. David incapacity attached to the sovereignty by the Con- find some delight in either repeating or exaggerating

OBIGIN OF THE ARTICLES.

"Paris, October 24, 1900.

which is the day before the wedding of the some explanation." "I have, as usual," writes James, 'respect.' As soon as the people cease to respect it "Many thanks for your article, which is just what present King to the present Queen, which took a had 1,000 printed, but I have told the printers it is done for, they will not respect it when they see good many copies of this paper, if that was what place, as I told you, on July 6, 1893, and he sailed to keep the type set for a week or so, that I can have that such attacks as we make can be made with success was in it? Then the last I will trouble you with at this stage is on that date. He had two daughters—one, the more printed if necessary. Do you think 1,000 will and with impunity." elder, Mrs. Napier, who will be called before you; be as much as we can dispose of? I should think to I think that James was anticipating events, and

REMARKABLE CORRESPONDENCE. tion, on November 19, 1910; in the second count there to you for the purpose of establishing the position King in Malta when either of the Misses Seymour that I may show how it was that this article was printed. He will give the order to the printer." street post-office. When inside he handed the parcel

woman. I have spoken with some English people had a share in the writing of the article or in out a special bigamy coronation number of the failed to get the information which was required for is mentioned in a letter to Mylius Sir Michael Culme- | before you, that he was circulating a most gross information which has been supplied by the defend- was writing to him that one of the objects of it was ant:--"Yours of the 6th to hand. . . . With regard to hit at the Monarchy-to destroy the respect of to annul it, and I did not know that Royal persons anticipated the libel had been set at rest by the were any exception to this rule under the law of statement made by Sir Arthur Bigge. They revived cannot, so far as I am acquainted with English law, marriage. That is his statement. son. We will clear away all subterfuges and dodgery, ' but what we must have is a knowledge of all the facts and of the law. I do not believe that English for the purpose, as James has said, "of spreading in a letter of October 14, from James to the defendant. Monarchy. There is no objection, or, at any rate, about 1,000, planning to send them to you by express' that I shall refer to in this case, to his spreading In point of fact you will have the opportunity of but found they would not accept the bundle until Republican ideas as much as he likes, provided

> see that this precedent holds good because he was wife. When you write, let me know what you think about this point. I am quite sure that we attack on the monarchy, but I wish to direct it in - such a manner as to deprive our opponents of legal defences and subterfuges. . . Perhaps you can give me valuable suggestions which will help

In a letter dated October 22 James wrote to the defendant:--" November Lib. in the press, containing strong article on subject we have been investigating When you examine a few of the letters which Think it will make a stir in London. The time come for hard hitting." I read you the letter October 24 in which there was a proposal to send the papers to the officers of the Army and Navy, and in which it was said :--" If we have not stated the facts correctly we will hear what the other side has to your regularity and fidelity. Be assured such things

—I am on the train between Bordeaux and Spain. opened in my presence and it contained about 1,000

AN EMPHATIC REPUDIATION.

J. Garland, Archdeacon of North Queensland, reference to certain statements which appeared in the Brisbane Telegraph:--

If you will just follow me for a few minutes... Brisbane Telegraph should have descended to publish took out three of those copies, and I now produce one Well, as you will readily understand, that is a dis- because I shall not detain you longer—to the letters an alleged detailed account of a supposed morganatic advantage which might conceivably in some cases to which I am going to call your attention, you will marriage of the King. For any such statement is 8.40 on the evening of the same day I saw that parcel absolutely false, and could only have been published delivered to the defendant at 18, Courtnell-street, either through ignorance or malice. You have Bayswater, by a messenger named Stevens, in the my authority for stating in whatever manner you may employment of Messrs. Stockwell and Co. I was think fit that King George was never married, morga- only three or four yards away, and I saw the parcel

year 1888 until some years after his marriage to her bigamy article I decided to publish the facts at once to put in the next Liberator on this question. I do November 11, and November 15, chosen to assert that that was a "sham and shameful Now on March 16 again James writes to the Majesty the Queen. Certainly he never was in Malta without waiting for further verification. The best not attach much credence to the statement made in 1890 or at any time approaching that period and quickest way to get at the truth is to begin to by Bigge and published in Reynolds's. If there was no read now, Mr. Mylius, do you? was an offence against the Church for the reason that "My dear Mr. Mylius,—I shall be glad to know Then it is said that he married a daughter of Admiral agitate the matter. If we have not stated the facts marriage, why do not these people explain why for according to his statement the King had in the year whether or not you were able to dispose of the Sir Michael Culme-Seymour. Now, fortunately, we correctly we will hear what the other side has to years every one has passed the word around that there was a marriage? We must run this matter down, and

you will remember, the Duke of Clarence died, and in employed for obtaining it, I should be glad to publish married to an officer in the Navy, a Mrs. Napier. it was he who was to supply whatever information as he had already printed and published the statement. consequence of that Prince George, as he then was, it, reserving, of course, your name, unless expressly And also you will have the evidence of the sons of there was to verify the statement about which James all that he had got apparently; and to that extent authorized by you to make known your name." Sir Michael Culme-Seymour. Unfortunately we has asked him. James, going on, makes this illu- he was quite entitled to this observation, that at any shall not be able to put Lady Culme-Seymour into minating statement, "the best way to get at the rate it was not a statement invented entirely by them-"Dear Mr. Mylius,—Yours of the 26th to hand. the witness-box on account of her state of health truth." . . . Never mind about such a detail selves. There was some colour given to the statement I shall await with interest the article you at the present moment, but you will have evidence as verifying the truth of such a grave statement, and there had been some sort of a rumour, as indicated his arm. He proceeded first to the Notting-hill-gate are sending me. It will come too late to be put in before you from a doctor which will establish that as this. Never mind that we have not any information by what I have already read to you. What it is that having contracted that first marriage, and having the April number, but I will keep it for the May issue. the condition in which she now is makes it impost the April number, but I will keep it for the May issue. the condition in which she now is makes it impost the April number, but I will keep it for the May issue. That is the High-If you will send me a list of any names of persons sible for her to attend the Court. Gentlemen, weapon to be used by the Liberator to hit at the read to you on October 30 it is impossible to conceive. words of the libel, "foully abandoned" this lady, who would be likely to be interested in the Liberator, Admiral Sir Michael Culme-Seymour went to Malta Monarchy. Publish it. If it is a lie, let the other Then, on November 11, James writes to Mylius:

| Weapon to be used by the Liberator, Inside the post-office hand the parcel to an assistant, who would be likely to be interested in the Liberator, and the parcel to an assistant, who would be likely to be interested in the Liberator, and the parcel to an assistant, who would be likely to be interested in the Liberator, and the parcel to an assistant, who would be likely to be interested in the Liberator, and the parcel to an assistant, who would be likely to be interested in the Liberator, and the parcel to an assistant, who would be likely to be interested in the Liberator, and the parcel to an assistant, who would be likely to be interested in the Liberator, and the parcel to an assistant, who would be likely to be interested in the Liberator, and the parcel to an assistant, who would be likely to be interested in the Liberator, and the parcel to an assistant, who would be likely to be interested in the Liberator, and the parcel to an assistant, who would be likely to be interested in the Liberator, and the parcel to an assistant, who would be likely to be interested in the Liberator, and the parcel to an assistant, who would be likely to be interested in the Liberator, and the parcel to an assistant, who would be likely to be interested in the Liberator, and the parcel to an assistant, who would be likely to be interested in the Liberator, and the likely to be interested in the Liberator, and the likely to be interested in the Liberator, and the likely to be interested in the Liberator, and the likely to be interested in the Liberator, and the likely to be interested in the Liberator, and the likely to be interested in the Liberator, and the likely to be interested in the Liberator, and the likely to be interested in the Liberator, and the likely to be intere he made a marriage in the year 1893 in order that he I will send the paper to them. It might be risky for to take command of the Flect in the Mediterranean side give their information. "After we have circus" I am waiting with interest news telling me what who, after weighing the parcel, gave Mylius a stamp, at the end of June—he received his command on the lated the information broadcast," so far as we are able you have decided with regard to having another which Mylius affixed, and then handed the brown-Act, so that there might be a valid marriage, and did not hesitate, according to the statement of this desident, to abandon the woman whom he had married in an earlier year, and, I suppose, the offsnring which I suppose, the offsnring which is the day before the wedding of the statement of this desident, who falls in with the British Monarchy is to cut away by 10 in., and about 4 in. or 5 in. thick.

I do not think that I can do better at this point than glad to know that you were pleased with the May in Malta, and who died unmarried. The ladies of diately on receiving this letter." Now, I read that out. Of course, it will remain for you, after you have street, Bayswater, about 7 o'clock in the evening, read to you the portions of this leaflet which are com- number of the Liberator. With your permission I the Seymour family never went to Malta until the in order that you might understand the position heard the evidence that will be laid before you, to near No. 18. About 20 minutes past 7 I saw the say whether such attacks as these can be made in defendant Mylius enter that house. Twenty minutes this country with impunity. On November 11, afterwards I saw him go out again. He was carrying James writes to the defendant:--"I wrote you to a brown-paper parcel about 12in. long and 2in, or Now then, I go back a little earlier in date in order communicate with Krishnavarma if you want more | 3in. thick. He went to the Notting-hill-gate High-

contradiction by Sir Arthur Bigge, he proceeded to I read that so that you may know how these articles make the publications which are charged against originated. I pass on to later letters, to a letter of him in this case, and which, at any rate as regards October 1, again from James to the defendant Mylius. | the dates November 29 and December 19, are admitted It has a postscript written in pencil on the back of publications. That, gentlemen, is really the whole

and this is, so far as I know, the first time that there have been aware, from the material I have placed and are not the children of such marriage regarded the Sovereign, if what they were alleging were true,

THE KING'S PERSONAL HONOUR.

The defendant knew also that this was being used

law can be as you say it is." There is just a passage, the Republican idea "-of an attack upon the "Dear Mr. Mylius—I tied up a big bundle of papers' there is no objection that I am going to make, or after the strike was over. I then sent you immediately he keeps within the law. It is not for the Monarchy Constitution is not a written affair, and, of course, by means of this case. The Monarchy in this country our opponents could argue from the standpoint of rests upon foundations more secure than any precedent showing that in former years marriages that could be undermined by the attacks of recognized, but, in the case of George V., I do not tection is sought for the King as a man, for the King as a husband, and for the King as a father. King. In submitting this case to you, I do not ask you to deal with it in any other way than you would the most ordinary case as between one citizen and another. The same rules of evidence and the same considerations must apply. You have to determine this case, and you will determine it of course upon the evidence that will be laid before you. You will judge it fairly and impartially. You will, I am sure, consider everything that can possibly be said or may be urged either as defence or in any other way by the lefendant. But you will also, I know, bear in mind this: that the King is none the less entitled to the verdict of a jury and to protection in an English Court of justice in any attack made upon his honour

> THE PUBLICATION OF THE LIBEL. Detective-Inspector James McBrian, of the

Criminal Investigation Department at Scotland Yard,

because he happens to be the King of England.

was the first witness. In examination by Mr. Muir he said:—On November 23 at 10 o'clock in the days ago and he spoke with the highest enthusiasm of morning I was at Newhaven. I went to the Customs shed and I saw there a brown-paper parcel. It was marked M.N. 9933, and was addressed to E. F. On November 2 James wrote:—" Dear Mr. Mylius, Mylius, 18, Courtnell-street, Bayswater. It was numbers of the November issue of the Liberator. After I had examined the contents the parcel was done up again and I proceeded to London. This copy of the Liberator now produced is one of the November issue, the same as I saw in the parcel. On the evening of the same day at 8.30 I was outside 18, Courtnell-

Did you see who took the parcel?--Yes, saw the defendant here take it, and I Sir Rufus Isaacs then read an extract from saw the defendant sign the receipt for it. This document now produced is the receipt. Coast Railway, and there I saw a brown paper parcel marked M.N. 6464 and addressed to E. F. Mylius, 18, Courtnell-street, Bayswater. The parcel was opened in my presence, and it contained about 500 'It is indeed surprising and regrettable that the copies of the December issue of the Liberator. I of them. The parcel was then done up again. At

natically or otherwise, until July 6, 1893, when, as delivered to the defendant Mylius. I saw the deof these statements. Now you will, of course, under a letter written on October 24 by James to the Duke of York, he married Princess Victoria Mary of fendant sign the receipt for it. This is the receipt man is free in this country to advocate political opinions and in active communication—"You are extremely stand that this which we believe to be the law really defendant. You see this would be a month at least reck, her present Majesty. Moreover, nothing in his produced. On December 26 I received a warrant —even to raise the question of the proper form of kind to take all this trouble for me. I am starting of the Constitution operates both for the prosecution before the first publication by this defendant of the Majesty's life could give the slightest ground for the from Sir Samuel Evans, the Vacation Judge, for the conception of such a cruel and wicked lie." arrest of the defendant, and requiring him to find That is on October 30, and it is enclosed by the bail to plead to and answer the ex officio information as he keeps within the law, which is framed on very you a few copies. I say that the paper is an 'International other witnesses who will be called before you and who fore this is written more than a month before the on it. What it is that would have been necessary in defendant at Scotland Yard, whither he had been order to satisfy him I am really at a loss to conceive. brought by one of my men. I told him the effect You have heard the statement which I have read, and of the warrant upon which he had been arrested, and "Dear Mr. Mylius,—Your letter of October 23 one would have imagined that nothing could be more he made no reply. On the same day—namely, has just been handed in. I think the proposal to emphatic and nothing could be more conclusive. In December 26—I went to his lodging at 18, Courtnellsend the paper to the officers of the Army and Navy a letter written on November 7 James wrote that street, taking with me the key which I found on the a good one. How many copies will be needed and some one "wanted more November Liberators. defendant. I found there a number of letters signed Let me just call attention to what the allegations what will be the best way to go about it? I sent you . I wrote to him to consult with you, and, by James. I produce those letters. Amongst them seemed to me that these different groups could be are, then I will tell you how they will be disproved. to-day a roll of November papers by post and also a if you thought fit, to write to Krishnavarma, asking are the letters which have been read by the Attorney-This prosecution is brought because this man has brought into more friendly relations with each other. It is first said that the King, when Prince George, bundle by express containing about 300. If you have to him to tell the printers to strike off another 1,000 General—letters dated February 13, March 16, chosen to circulate in this country in this leaflet an The time also seemed ripe in England for some kind contracted this marriage in 1890 at Malta. Well, pay anything at your end keep track of the matter and send you by express. . . . Write me about March 27, March 30, May 2, August 5, October 1, attack upon the King, in respect of the marriage which of change. I therefore decided, after conversation you will hear that he never was in Malta after the and I will reimburse you. . . . In writing the the discussion in London so that I can have something October 24, November 2, The LOED CHIEF JUSTICE.—You do not wish them

The defendant.—No, my Lord.

The Lord Chief Justice.—Have you any question to put to this witness, Mr. Mylius? The defendant.—No, my Lord.

Detective-constable Auger, of Scotland Yard, examined by Mr. Rowlatt, said:-On November 29 last I was near 18, Courtnell-street, shortly after 10 o'clock at night, and I saw Mylius come out of 18, Courtnell-street, with a brown-paper parcel under

The witness.—Yes, my Lord.

"I am in receipt of your letter of April 30, and am the other, the younger, who died in the year 1895 would be sufficient; you might drop me a card imme- apparently not quite correctly as they have turned Rowlarr, said :—On December 19 I was in Courtnell-

it back to Mylius with a stamp.

ADMIRAL CULME-SEYMOUR'S STATEMENT. Admiral Sir Michael Culme-Seymour was next

examined by the Solicitor-General. You are a baronet, are you not?—Yes. And a G.C.B. and G.C.V.O.?—Yes.

What was the year of your marriage?--1866. How many children have been born of the marriage? -Five. Three boys and two girls. Give us the names of the two girls, please, the

elder first?—Elizabeth. She was born, I think, in 1871?—Yes, in 1871. Is that elder daughter still living?—Yes, she is England too. still living.

She married, I think, Captain Trevelyan Napier?-

In 1899?-Yes. The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE.—We had better have the full baptismal name.

The witness.—Mary Elizabeth. The Solicitor-General (to the witness).—She is in Court?—Yes.

What was the name of your younger daughter?—

Laura Grace. She was born, I think, on July 18, 1873?——Yes. Can you tell us what was the first occasion when either of your daughters visited Malta?-They came out there when I was Commander-in-Chief of the Mediterranean Fleet. I went out in July, 1893, and my wife and two daughters came out in the November

following. That is November, 1893?—Yes.

The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE.—You were asked world?—Yes. whether that was the first time they went to Malta?---Yes, that was the first time they had been in Malta. The Solicitor-General.—Did they pass that winter, 1893-4, in Malta with you?--Yes.

And I think went away again in the summer?— They went home in the summer of the following year. Did they come out again in the autumn of 1894?-

And the same thing happened in the autumn of Your younger daughter has died. I think?--Yes,

she died on November 22, 1895, at Malta. She would then be 22 years of age?—Yes. Your daughter Laura Grace died at Malta. Was

she buried there?--Yes, she was buried at Malta. Had she ever been married?—No, never. During the periods you speak of, when your

daughters were in Malta, had his Majesty the King ever been in Malta at all?—He was never there the whole time I was there. And that includes the time when both your

daughters were there?—Yes. To the best of your knowledge had your younger daughter even spoken to his Majesty?--No, I am quite sure she never had.

As far as you know, had she ever been in his presence?--No, I think not, except that the day before I left for the Mediterranean on July 6, 1893, I was with her at a garden party at Marlborough House. She may have seen his Majesty there.

The 6th of July, 1893, was also the day of the marriage of the present King. Was the garden Yes. party you speak of held in connexion with the ceremony?—I really do not know whether it was or not. I know there was a garden party at Marlborough | terranean? -- Yes.

Was your younger daughter with you on that was there?—Yes, I went out twice. occasion?—Yes, she was.

Now, your other daughter, Mrs. Napier, as far as | The next time in the spring of 1895. you are aware has she ever met the present King?---I believe she met him when she was staying on year of his appointment?---Yes. board the Britannia when the present King was a cadet on board. She was then eight years old. The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE.—What date was that?— About 1879.

The Solicitor-General.—And after that was there any further occasion of meeting that you know of?-No. She may have seen him at Court when she has gone past, but she never met him until she met him at my house when I was Commander-in-Chief at Portsmouth and he came to visit me there.

When was that?—In 1898. Lord Spencer's? Were you present then?—No; had never been to Malta before 1893. I was not in England at the time. I do not think it was at Lord Spencer's. I think it was at Lord

Derby's.

go down with the ship?---He did. The Solicitor-General.—Let me ask you this.

I was appointed before. I hoisted my flag formally was on October 23, 1888. in the President on June 29, and I left England on July 6.

That was the day of the marriage?—Yes. Neither of your daughters ever came out to Malta service on any ship which went to Malta in the year until after that date?—No.

Lady Seymour is living?—Oh, yes. Is she in a very bad state of health?—Yes, her He was not. heart is affected and it is impossible to bring her up

Do you wish to ask the witness any questions? The defendant.-No, thank you, my Lord. LADY CULME-SEYMOUR'S HEALTH. Dr. Bernard Roworth Turner, of Oundle, Northamptonshire, examined by Mr. Rowlatt, said that

he was now attending Lady Seymour, who was in Northamptonshire. Yesterday.

What was then her state of health?-It was such that it would have been absolutely dangerous to bring her here.

The defendant did not cross-examine the witness.

MRS. NAPHER AS A WITNESS.

examined by Mr. Murk. You are a daughter of Sir Michael Culme-Seymour? Are you married to Captain Trevelyan Napier?___!

When were you married to him?-On August 17, He is still alive?—Yes.

to Captain Napier?-No. Did you first see his present Majesty the King in Roman Catholic registers, registers of the different 1879?—In 1879 or 1878. I am not quite sure Protestant churches, registers of the non-united

That was on board the Britannia when he was a cadet?—Yes. You were then seven or eight years old?—Yes. | Civil registers as well as in the parish registers.

Did you next see his Majesty on February 16, 1893 ?—I think I saw him at a party at Lord Spencer's. The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE.—Was it at Lord Spencer's ?—Yes. Mr. Mure.—Did you speak to him at all on that have no Civil form.

occasion?--No. Did you next see his Majesty in 1897 at your exhaustive, from the proper custody in Malta?--father's house in Portsmouth?-No; in 1898. When your father was Commander-in-Chief at

Portsmouth?—Yes. dates?-No, to the best of my recollection, unless I side the Court?-They are here.

saw him at Court. We arrived there on November 17, 1893—my sister, | bearing on this matter?—I have.

my mother, and I. That was nearly five months after the present have done it yourself?—Yes. King and Queen were married?-Yes.

And then returned to England?-Yes.

November, 1894. Did you return to England from that second visit | understand. The others I do understand. in the spring of 1895?—Yes.

1895?—Yes. And did you return to England in the spring of Culme, or Culme-Seymour?--There is not.

1896 ?---Yes. ever been in Malta?-Never.

During the years 1886, 1887, and 1888 were you

Was his Majesty the King in Malta at all while you were there?—No, he was not.

For how long?—For five or six weeks. With that exception were you in England through-

out the whole of those three years?—Yes. Were you and your sister companions?—Yes. except that I think she went over to Boulogne one day and was there a few hours.

In the year 1890 where were you?—I was in England or in Scotland. Were you out of the island of Great Britain that

year?—No. And your sister, where was she?—She was in Throughout the whole of the year 1890?—Yes. Would you know if your sister had ever con-

tracted a marriage?—Yes, certainly. Did she ever marry?-No. This concluded the examination of Mrs. Napier.

The Lord Chief Justice.-Now, Mr. Mylius, any The defendant.—No, thank you, my Lord.

OTHER MEMBERS OF THE FAMILY. Captain Michael Culme-Seymour, R.N., was the

Mr. Rowlatt.—Are you at present captain of his Majesty's ship Argyll?—Yes. And you are the eldest son of Admiral Sir Michael Culme-Seymour?--Yes. You have been in the Navy since March, 1883?-

And have held commissions in various parts of the

Were you in Malta in 1893?--Yes, I arrived there in the Howe just before Christmas, 1893. How long did you remain on that station?—A year and ten months.

That would be till September, 1895?—Yes. Do you remember whether your mother and sisters came out to Malta in 1893?—Yes, I remember they

were there when I arrived. Did they remain there during the winter?—Yes. And were they out the next winter?—Yes. The third winter you had left there?—Yes.

Did you keep in close correspondence with your sisters?—Yes, very close. So far as you know were they ever in Malta before 1893 or on any but the occasions that have been

mentioned?--No. No questions were asked by the defendant. Mr. John Wentworth Culme-Seymour then gave

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL.—You are, I think, concerned in the work of Oxford House, Bethnal-green?-

And you are the second of the three sons of Sir Michael Culme-Seymour?—Yes. The Lord Chief Justice.—May I ask you to give us the order of the children? Who is the eldest of the family?—Michael is the eldest, Mary comes next, and then came my other sister.

The two sisters came in between Michael and you. That is what I wanted to know. The ATTORNEY-GENERAL .-- During 1893, except

at holiday time, you were at school at Winchester?

Do you remember your father proceeding to Malta to take up the command of the Fleet in the Medi-

Did you yourself go out to Malta at all while he In what year?--The first time in December, 1893.

Was the first time you went out during the first You were living in close touch with your sisters?

So far as you know was it the first visit they had paid, in 1893, to the island of Malta?—Yes. They were there when you arrived?—Yes.

Rowlatt:-In 1893 I was at school at Wellington. my father. My sisters were there too. I went There was another occasion, was there not, at not go out in 1894. So far as I know, my sisters

EVIDENCE FROM THE ADMIRALTY.

Mr. Charles Walker, head of the Commission and As far as you know, is that the extent of the meet- Warrant Branch of the Admiralty, who was examined ings which have taken place at any time between by the ATTORNEY-GENERAL, said:--The orders of which he served between January 14, 1886, and The Victoria disaster occurred on June 22, 1893?— July 6, 1893. I have also an extract of the logs of

ships every day.

The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE.—On what ship?—The

1890?—He was not. Or after October 23, 1888, up to July 6, 1893?----

When was the next occasion after October 23, 1888. The Lord Chief Justice (to the defendant).— | Majesty was in Malta?—On March 25, 1901, when | Dominions beyond the Seas.

The Lord Chief Justice.-Was that on the way out or the way home?—On the way out.

succeeded in command of the Mediterranean Fleet

The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE.—How long had Sir Mrs. Mary Elizabeth Napier was next called and George Tryon been at Malta?--I cannot say. think he was Commander-in-Chief about two years.

THE CROWN ADVOCATE OF MALTA. The Hon. Vincenzo Frendo Azopardi, Crown Advo-

cate, Malta, was the next witness. In reply to the Solicitor-General he stated:— information ex officio. I have collected and brought to this country the marriage registers of Malta for the period 1886 to You had not been married before you were married July 6, 1893, the date of the wedding of the present King and Queen. The registers fall into classes-

> Greek Church, and Civil registers. In answer to the LORD CHIEF JUSTICE, Mr. Azopardi said that marriages had to be registered in the

> The Solicitor-General.—By the law of Malta is marriage registration compulsory?--It is.

Have you retained them in your custody in order to bring them over to England, and have you kept been no cx officio information filed in England since Culme-Seymour, an Admiral of the British Navy, Had you seen his Majesty at all between those them in proper custody, and are they here just out 1830."

Have you conducted a search through these When did you pay your first visit to Malta?— registers in order to see whether there is any entry The Lord Chief Justice.—Do you mean that you

The Solicitor-General.—The registers are in Did you stay in Malta till the spring of 1894?— two or three languages, all of which are known to evidence that the ordinary remedies by action or and it is only because, having regard to the nature of you but one, the Greek, and there you were assisted indictment are insufficient in the particular case. the defence that I shall in a very few sentences call Was your second visit to Malta during the winter Yes; the registers are in Latin or Italian or English; was formerly taken into consideration; and in- defendant has suggested that he has some right to of 1894?—Yes; we arrived there in October or but there is one register—that of the non-united formations have been granted. . . But now it is call upon the person defamed, because he is the

Was your third visit to Malta made in November, through that series of years, there is any entry of the any words which would be libellous and actionable take it from me the defendant has no such right. If the marriage of a lady bearing the name Seymour, or per se if printed and published of any other public defendant is prepared to prove, as he by his plea said

EVIDENCE OF SIR ARTHUR BIGGE.

the King, was the last witness called. The ATTORNEY-GENERAL .-- You were the only private secretary of his present Majesty from the time of Queen Victoria's death until he ascended the Throne ?---Yes.

Were you present at the marriage of his Majesty the King and her Majesty the Queen?-I was. That was on July 6, 1893?—Yes. private secretaries?—Yes.

In the second paragraph under the third heading of the justification put in by the defendant there is this passage:--"A certain person named Arthur Bigge, purporting to be the secretary to the said There is abundant authority for the King of England, has caused to be published in a certain newspaper called Reynolds's Newspaper of October 30, 1910, a statement affirming that the said King of England was not and is not and has never been married to any other person than the said daughter of the Duke of Teck." Is that the issue of

King?—I was. The ATTORNEY-GENERAL read the statement which

witness) in which the statement was reproduced?---

had been read by the Attorney-General in his opening statement, and are given above.) When was that letter written?-On August 8.

To the gentleman named?—To Archdeacon Gar-

death of Queen Victoria in 1901. Court adjourned for luncheon.

THE DEFENCE.

to call evidence.

The defendant.—I shall call some evidence, but before I do so I should like to address the Court with reference to the methods adopted by the prosecution, and I should also like to read out to the Court some quotations from important legal authorities bearing upon procedure in this particular case. The Lord Chief Justice.—You can

had better do that at the end of your evidence, you are going to give evidence. The defendant.—I should prefer to do it now. The Lord Chief Justice.—Very well. foolscap pages in an indistinct voice).—In the chapter entitled "Practice and Evidence in Pro- the time because I did not wish to do so. You said most trivial character which you would consider great position is to a large extent debarred from taking ceedings by way of Criminal Information" of "Odgers subsequently that the Court had not the power to proved by the suggestions of this defence? The ordinary means of protecting himself. There are, on Libel" there are two systems dealt with. In subparia the prosecutor. The Attorney-General other daughter, Mrs. Napier, has been brought before the first the Attorney-General may file an ex officio has stated that this is an action which is similar you. She, of course, knew her dead sister well, and information of his own motion; secondly, all other to an action between one citizen and another. If she says that she knows that her sister never was of this kind, and it was to that vile class that you informations can only be filed after the Crown Attorney that were so you would have equality before the married. And then you also know from the evidence has moved the Court for an order nisi, calling upon law, but here you have an action where there is no that Admiral Seymour and his family never went to is wholly inadequate to the offence, but fortunately the defendant to show cause why an information equality, where the privilege of the King comes Malta at all until the Admiral sailed on July 6, 1893. should not be granted. Now I have been pro- into conflict with the Constitutional rights of the strangely enough, the day on which his present or more severe sentences would be passed. I have ceeded against by the first method. The guarantees subject. If the privilege of the King is to be con- Majesty was married, and the mother and two considered whether I should treat these libels as which are given to the accused by the second method sidered so sacred, then I consider that the Consti- daughters went out in 1893. They paid other separate libels, as I might do; but, having regard to Captain George Culme-Seymour, of the 60th Rifles; are swept away. What are the guarantees pro- tutional rights of the subject are equally sacred. visits to Malta, but neither his Majesty, nor the two the dignity of the law which I endeavour to ada brother of the last witness, said, in answer to Mr. vided in the second method? The defendant is The King has made no sworn denial of the charges girls, nor one of them who is alleged to have been a minister, I do not think it right to treat the offence summoned to appear and show cause why the informa- which have been made against him; the King has not party to this marriage, was at Malta at the time as more than one out of many. We know there were At the end of the year I went to Malta to stay with tion should not be granted against him. The prose- contradicted of his own free will in the witness-box alleged. So little does this defendant seem to care about hundreds, or thousands, of these scandalous publicacutor—in this case, the King—must come into any of those charges, and I ask you to summon my evidence. The Crown has gone to the expense and again to Malta after my sister died in 1895. I did Court in the first instance, and must not have accuser and let him deny the truth of my statement. trouble—the expense, of course, is nothing—of I can inflict if I do not treat the matter as a consecuattempted to obtain redress in other ways (R. v. If you refuse to require the filing of the affidavit bringing over all the registers. You know that a tive libel. I sentence you to 12 months' imprison-Marshall, 4 E. and B., 475). The affidavits on which or the sworn testimony of the King in the witness- legal marriage in Malta—and it has never been ment. the application is based must be the sworn affidavits box I submit the Court has absolutely no jurisdiction suggested that there was other than a legal marof the prosecutor. All particulars of the charge whatever to proceed any further with my case or to riage—has to be registered both in the church and must be contained in them. There must be a specific send me to prison. I move on those grounds that the civil registry. They have gone to the trouble of denial of the particular charges, even where it is a the action be dismissed. either of your daughters and the present King?— the Board of Admiralty for the appointment of Dougl., 387). I will quote Stephen's Commentaries you. officers in the Royal Naval Service are carried out on the Laws of England, Volume IV., p. 374:--I think you succeeded Sir George Tryon in the in my Department and recorded. I produce the "The informations that are exhibited in the name further. Mediterranean Command?—Yes, I went out to appointments of his Majesty the King to ships on of the Sovereign in criminal cases are of two kinds those which are truly and properly his own suits, and filled ex officio by his own immediate officer, the ships to which his Majesty was appointed. From the Attorney-General; secondly, those in which, The Lord Chief Justice.—Did Sir George Tryon | these log books I can ascertain the movements of the | though the Crown is the nominal prosecutor, yet | it is at the relation of some private person or common Will you tell me from these log books and the informer. And these last are filed by the Sovereign's there, as I have been denied the Constitutional written this in antagonism to and with a view to I am authorized by his Majesty to state publicly You did not go out to take up that command until records on what date it was that his Majesty was last coroner and attorney, usually called "the Master right of a fair trial. after the marriage of the present King and Queen?— on service on one of the King's ships at Malta?—It of the Crown Office"; who is, for this purpose, the standing officer of the public. The objects of the Sovereign's own criminal information, filed ex officio it now becomes my duty in a very few sentences to by his Attorney-General, are properly such enormous present this case to you. You have heard from he had a great deal to do with the preparation of the The Attorney-General.—Was his Majesty on misdemeanours as peculiarly tend to disturb or the defendant, who has not himself gone into the libel. You heard the correspondence read—of which endanger his Government, or to malign or affront box or called any witness into the box him in the regular discharge of his Royal functions. all, that he does not propose to raise any For offences so high and dangerous in the punish other point except the points which he st ment or prevention of which a moment's delay would mitted to me—that I ought to dismiss this inforbe fatal, the law has given to the Crown the power of mation upon the ground of the ex officio information

according to the Admiralty records, on which his immediate prosecution by this method, without by the Attorney-General, or that I ought to call waiting for any previous application to any other for affidavits from the persons who could give evidence passing through the Mediterranean station in the tribunal; which power, thus necessary not only in support of such information, because no such Ophir, which was commissioned as the King's ship to the ease and safety, but even to the very existence affidavits were filed before the application was lodged. of the Executive Government, was originally reserved | Well, as a matter of fact, the evidence that could be | in the great plan of the English Constitution, where obtained in such affidavits is before you to-day in provision is wisely made for the due preservation of the fullest measure. But, gentlemen of the jury, all its parts." In this passage I submit it is clear | that is not the ground upon which I declined to accede The Attorney-General.—You have got the that the objects of the information ex officio are to Mr. Mylius's application. I tell you—and you! Mr. Rowlatt.—When did you see her last?— actual official dates of the loss of the Victoria and enormous misdemeanours of a political nature. will take the law from me, for if I go wrong in the the commission of Admiral Culme-Seymour?— My alleged offence was an enormous misdemeanour law the Court of Appeal will set me right—it is the June 22, 1893, was the date when the Victoria went of a political nature. Yet here is the inconsistency right of the Attorney-General in any matter of libel down and Sir George Tryon was lost. He was of the Crown. They proceed as if it were a political or of public wrong which he thinks of sufficient imporoffence, and then they pretend that my alleged offence | tance to justify a criminal information, it is his right, by Admiral Culme-Seymour, whose appointment is is to be considered as a personal offence and not political and in one sense his duty, to file a criminal information cal at all. The only way to proceed for a personal tion. This is not the opportunity nor the occasion Price 4/- each offence, no matter whether it is against the King or for quoting precedent, but I tell you—and you may against one of his subjects, is by information in take the law from me—it is an entire mistake to the ordinary way, and before the Court will grant the imagine that this method of proceeding is obsolete

TWO KINDS OF INFORMATIONS.

Again—I quote from Odgers, p. 427—" Criminal to prove the truth of it, and has failed to satisfy you Again—1 quote from Udgers, p. 427— Uriminal that it was in the public interest that such a thing informations are of two kinds—(1) those filed by the should be said. Attorney-General himself, usually called ex officio nformations; (2) those filed by the King's Coroner and Attorney by direction of the King's Bench Gentlemen, you will not forget that this Division at the instance of some private individual. | defendant up to this present moment—that is to The first class—that is informations ex officio—is, say, until he rose to address me—has alleged that as a rule, confined to libels of so dangerous a nature the disgraceful charge which he brought against his as to call for immediate suppression by the officers Majesty was true, and that he was prepared to of the State; especially blasphemous, obscene, or prove it. He has up to the last moment justified seditious libels, or such as are likely to cause immediate himself by his statement that the charges were Is not it possible for one to be married in the Civil outrage and public riot and disturbance. In these true, and you will remember that with referform without any religious ceremony at all?—We cases, therefore, the Attorney-General himself takes ence to the main allegation, which is the most the initiative. There has, I believe, been no ex important thing into which we have to inquire, Did you receive these registers, which you say are officio information filed in England since 1830." he by his plea stated "that during the year

have got it wrong.

corrected to 1887.

Greek Church—which is in Greek, which I do not settled that rank confers no superior claim to the King of England, to come down into this box and summary interference of the Court." Then later it is submit himself to some questions that might be put Will you tell us whether in all those registers, said:—"It is sedition to speak or publish of the King to him by the defendant. Gentlemen, you again will character. Thus, any words will be deemed seditions he was, he must be prepared to prove by evidence I think that the name of Seymour occurs once, which strike at the King's private life and conduct." | that he can adduce before a jury, and I will remind you | With the exception of these three visits have you but that it was the name of the bridegroom and not Now, in this particular case there was no application in a moment-that not one single question has been of the bride?—That is so. to the Court made upon affidavit, because it was the put by the defendant by way of cross-examination And you know the man?-I personally know the Attorney-General who brought an extofficio information and of these withesses-who were equally, in one man in question. The sense many of them, defamed as much as his Majesty

to a post-office assistant, who weighed it and handed in or out of England?—I was out of England in the registers which gives the slightest suspicion of sup- be allowed, or is it trying the defendant for a libellous down the evidence that they have given. Gentlemen, no explanation. You know that on two occasions, port to what is here suggested?—Not the slightest. injury, as mere defamation of character? If the for one moment let us disregard the fact that this, just before the November and December publication, At the request of the Solicitor-General the Crown is trying the defendant for seditions libel, if it were untrue, is a gross and disgraceful libel upon were posted, not merely single copies. Now, gentledefendant produced a notice dated January 24, 1911, the course adopted by the Attorney-General in laying the King. I tell you, and you know it without my men, that is the state in which the evidence is left signed by the Director of Public Prosecutions on an exofficio information was the proper course to take, telling you, that a man cannot, according to our law, by the defendant. I have to ask you whether you behalf of the Attorney-General, intimating to him but if the Crown is proceeding for defamatory language state that which is untrue in fact, and then ask that find him guilty of publishing a malicious libel against And are you able to say where your sister was that arrangements had been made for the production then it is an improper course. The Crown have pro- the person who complains may be put into the box his Majesty on November 29, and whether you find during those years?—She was not abroad in either of the original registers of marriages in Malta between the dates on which the dates of the d 1886 and 1893, and specifying the dates on which the tion. The King should have taken the position of or what he suggests is a true, statement, or endefendant might inspect the registers at New Scotland | private prosecutor, should have appeared in Court, deavour to pretend that there is evidence by which he had stated before. He said,—"The Daily and have made affidavits. I therefore demand that asking questions of a witness, whether he News of London informs us that the King lands in the prosecution be forced to elect either to try me could give evidence or whether he could not for sedition or for ordinary defamatory libel. I The simple question is whether or not you find this Sir Arthur Bigge, one of the private secretaries to ask the prosecution whether this is an action for defendant guilty of unlawfully and maliciously libel on either of those dates. Gentlemen, I scarcely sedition or for ordinary defamatory libel. If this is devising and intending to injure, vilify, and prejudice think you desire to retire, but if you desire to do so an action for a defamatory libel, I ask the Attorney. the King of his good name, fame, and reputation, General why the prosecutor's affidavits have not by the publication of scandalous, malicious, and

> Mr. Mylius, not the Attorney-General. as to ask the Attorney-General why the affidavits intelligence or insult your feelings by reading these him guilty on all three charges, my Lord. On October 30, 1910, you were one of his Majesty's have not been filed, and, if they have not been filed, words again. They charge his Majesty with having The Associate then put the question formally I ask that they be filed immediately.

tell you that there is ample evidence on this criminal information, and that none of your objections apply. adopted by the Attorney-General in many previous proceedings, and, in fact, I may tell you that it is the only course the Attorney-General could adopt. THE DEFENDANT'S APPLICATION.

The defendant.—My Lord, if the Court refuses Reynolds's Newspaper (handing a newspaper to the to require the filing of the affidavits I move that the statement. action be dismissed because there is no precedent for this particular method. If the prosecutor does "Purporting to be the secretary"—At that time not swear or deny the truth of his statements, then terms. This libel states, as you will remember, you were in fact one of the private secretaries to the it ceases to be, I submit, an action for defamatory the specific fact of the marriage of the present King libel. As your Lordship has ruled against me, I to the daughter of one who held one of the highest will now state the grounds upon which I ask to call positions in her late Majesty's Service. The defendant appeared in Reynolds's Newspaper of the date men- upon my first witness, that is the King, to enter the seems to think nothing of the wickedness of defaming tioned, together with Sir Arthur Bigge's letter. (They witness-box. I have been informed by your Lordship those people; as I have said, although the evidence already in Chambers, and your Lordship wrote to has taken two hours to take down, we may state it me, that the Court had not the power to issue a in almost three minutes. A marriage is alleged to language indicating the disgraceful nature of the

The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE.-I only wrote to you the then Duke of York (his present Majesty) and one because I received your letter after I had heard of the daughters of Sir Michael Culme-Seymour. The Lord Chief Justice.—When did you first you in Chambers. I was not certain that it applied You have had it now proved in evidence—and become private secretary to the Prince of Wales or to the same application. I only wanted you to tell you you must, in this case, as in all others, act on the King?—I became private secretary to the present know that I treated it as the same application, and evidence—you have had it proved in evidence, that aggravation of your offence, for let me tell you—and King, when Duke of York, immediately after the that if you had any other application to make you his Majesty was never in Malta after the year 1888 should point it out to me: Further, I pointed out until long after his marriage with the present Queen. This closed the case for the prosecution, and the to you that you suggested no conceivable ground Through all those years—it is not a question of a on which the evidence of his Majesty was likely to | month or a day—from October, 1888, to July, 1893,

Upon resuming after lunch, the Lord Chief was present; I was not represented by counsel, and that gallant officer has gone into the box and has told JUSTICE asked the defendant whether he proposed I submit, with respect, that it was not quite the thing you the truth about that. This defendant seems to ask me what I wished to state through my witness. | think that a jury are to disbelieve people upon their | (The remainder of the defendant's statement at this oaths, because he chooses to say he wishes to ask some-

The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE.—It is rather better that | are to be believed unless evidence is given to the I should state what happened. You were applying contrary. The Admiral said he had two daughters. to me to issue a subparia and I desired, as you had The younger would have been 17 in the year 1890 address no solicitor or counsel, to hear all that you had to and she died some five years later. She had lived been made a party to the publication of infamous and me on any points of law you wish to raise, but you say. It was for that reason, in your own interests, with her sister at home, in constant friendship, of scandalous lies. I know not whether you have been that I asked you what fact you suggested his Majesty | course, and against her memory, if this story were could prove, and it: was then that you said that you true, very disgraceful charges were brought. had no facts which he could prove. I then said particular girl, only 17 in the year 1890, lived in her civilized world would recoil with shame from the use that, quite apart from that fact, I had no power to father's family until she died, and her father has of such weapons against any one, and most of all

The defendant.—I did not advance a reason at of truth in the charges. Is there any fact of the this Empire are devotedly attached, and who by his

duke that is aspersed (Rex v. Haswell and Bate, 1 | The Lord Chief Justice.—Proceed, I rule against a lawful marriage there is not a trace, nor is there This information cannot be dismissed.

The defendant.—Then I refuse to proceed any transaction of the kind. to call evidence.

anything more, Mr. Mylius? The defendant.—No, my Lord. I rest my case not to proceed against this man because he may have read.

THE SUMMING-UP. The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE.—Gentlemen of the jury, information the prosecutor must come into Court and or has not been put in force. It has been put in force swear an affidavit to the effect that the charges against in my own experience, and not infrequently during him were untrue. It is an untenable position for the the last century. Therefore you will apply your prosecution to take up in a case which is based on an | minds to that which you have to consider—that is, | whether or not this defendant has published a defamatory libel against his Majesty, and has failed

The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE.-1887. I think you 1890, in the Island of Malta, the man who is now the King of England was united in lawful and The defendant.—Odgers says, "There has, I believe, holy wedlock with the daughter of Sir Michael and that thereafter, to wit, on the 6th day of July, The Lord Chief Justice.—In the last edition it is 1893, he who is now the said King of England, his lawful wife still being alive, did enter into a false The defendant.—"In the second class of informa- and bigamous marriage with a daughter of the tions the relator is generally some private individual Duke of Teck. And this the defendant stands who has been defamed. But still the words complained | ready to prove." Gentlemen, it is difficult even in of must be such as call for the prompt and immediate my position to use language which sufficiently coninterference of the Court. There must be some veys one's opinion of such a defence to such a charge, . The rank and dignity of the person libelled your attention to what evidence is before you. The And is there any entry to be discovered in these defendant for sedition, when no justification would -- to qualify, to vary, still less to contradict or break

THE DEFENDANT'S POSITION.

The Lord Chief Justice.—Kindly address me, from the "replication" in the pleadings.] Gentle-

men, you have the information before you. I will The defendant.—I ask your Lordship to be so good give-you a copy of it. I will not really insult your the Foreman of the Jury rose and said:—We find The Lond Chiur Justice.—I rule against you, and Admiral, and that she bore children to him. It is three counts.

THE SENTENCE. in the year 1890 married the daughter of a British and the verdict was stated to be unanimous, on the expressing my opinion. It alleges that he then acted in a disgraceful manner by marrying his present wife. risen from his seat) said:--Mr. Mylius, you have no Well, gentlemen, it is really a lamentable thing that right to say anything to me, but if you have anya man should not only publish it, but should come thing to say before I pass sentence upon you I will into Court and repeat the plea, and say it is true in hear you, but you must direct it solely to that? the most solemn form, without having a vestige, or a scrap, or a shadow, of evidence in support of the test, and I have nothing more to say. THE EVIDENCE.

Libels must be justified according to their

subpana to the King. A second to the King. The second have taken place in Malta in the year 1890 between be of any service to you. To be a service in Malta at all. With The defendant.—My Lord, the Attorney-General regard to the daughters of Sir Michael Culme-Seymour, | may stage was inaudible except to those immediately body else a question. The rule of our Courts is the around him.); same for the high as for the low, and people of credit

The defendant (who read from a sheaf of blue issue a subpæna upon his Majesty. said, and her only sisten has said, there is not a shadow bringing these registers for your inspection, and of any entry which can possibly correspond to any

> subverting the Government of this country. At that he was never married except to the Queen another stage of the proceedings, should you consider and that he never went through any ceremony the charge is established against him, that may be of marriage except with the Queen. And further that material. It is important to consider whether this his Majesty would have attended to give evidence to man was a mere dummy or messenger, or whether this effect had he not received advice from the

a malicious libel at a later period, following up that India with his wife. Will the newspaper kindly tell us which wife?" Will you be good enough to tell me you will, of course, do so. I am going to hand you a copy of the information in which you will find set out in terms the libel charged.

After about a minute's deliberation in the box,

The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE (the defendant having The defendant.—My Lord, I have made my pro-

The Lord CHIEF JUSTICE then passed sentence amid perfect silence, saying:---

Edward Frederick Mylius, you have been convicted of the publication against his Majesty the King of three gross and infamous libels. You have charged him with conduct which, if committed by a subject of the Crown, would amount to felony according to the laws of England, and which any Christian gentleman or man of honour would condemn and despise. You have accompanied these charges by gross and abusive conduct which you have imputed to his Majesty. The libel suggests that this action of yours is designed to further some cause which is opposed to the Constitution established in these realms, and especially to the position of his Majesty. If this be so, it is a gross

in this observation every person of honour will concur -that no cause can be advanced by the use of these scandalous and detestable weapons—the bringing of slanderous and infamous accusations against honourable men and women, in whatever station of life they

There is in your offence another circumstance of great aggravation—the most ordinary investigation, which any honourable man would unquestionably have undertaken, must have shown you that the gross charges which you were publishing could not be true. The date at which Admiral Seymour went to Malta was perfectly well known, as it followed a great national disaster. The most ordinary inquiry would have shown you that you had acting under the influence of others. This I do This know: that every honourable man and woman in the , against his Majesty the King, to whom the people of alas! in this world, too many people willing to circulate—aye! amplify, even believe—scandalous stories appealed. The sentence I am about to pass upon you this practice has not prevailed largely of recent years, tions. I sentence you to the maximum punishment

. The prisoner was then escorted away by the police. officers who had him in charge.

SIGNED DECLARATION BY THE

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL, rising again, said :-- Now that sentence has been passed in this case, there is a Gentlemen, I do not propose to go through the matter to which I should like to refer, and which I did The Lord Chief Justice.—You said you wished other part of the evidence, material from some not think your Lordship would have thought it right · points of view. It is not material for your con- for me to mention until after verdict and sentence had The defendant.—That is my evidence, my Lord. | sideration as to what motive prompted the de- | been passed. I hold in my hands at this moment a The Lord Chief Justice.—Do you wish to say fendant to publish this libel. I agree with the document under the hand of his Majesty the King, learned Attorney-General that this prosecution is from which with your Lordship's permission I will

> Law Officers of the Crown that it would be unconwe have one side—which speaks in the clearest tones, stitutional for him to do so. That statement, my and of which the defendant, Mylius, has given you Lord, is signed by the King himself.

CONTINENTAL

:: ATLAS ::

Proof of their Superiority

STEEL STUDDED NON-SKID. THREE RIBBED are being adopted as standard by all

motor manufacturers. CONTINENTAL TYRE AND RUBBER Co. (Great Britain), Ltd. 102-108, Clerkenwell Road, E.C.

bonaparte T IMPOTOTT

The Standard Biography in the English Language. Illustrated from Rare Prints and Portraits. A Library Edition in 4 Demy 8vo Volumes (1,876 pages).

By Professor W. M. SLOANE.

When the previous Edition was issued in the year 1896, it was the intention of the author to prepare a Library Edition in smaller and more convenient size for reading and for the bookshelf. The issue of this edition has been delayed for a number of years, during

which time much new light has been thrown upon the career of Napoleon, and Professor Sloane's great work as now issued contains more than ten per cent. of entirely new matter. As originally issued it received the highest praise from critics the world over-as now put forth it may be considered the definitive Life of Napoleon.

> CLOTH HALF MOROCCO, art linen sides, gilt top edge TREE CALF, gilt top edge ... ALSO MAY BE Convenient Instalments.

Cash Prices for the Four Volumes.

The Times Book Club, 376 to 384, Oxford Street, London, W.

Company of the

The Largest Bookshop in the World.

TRIAL OF MYLIUS FOR

CRIMINAL LIBEL.

THE KING'S HONOUR.

VERDICT AND SENTENCE.

The following document, signed by the King, was read by the Attorney-General in Court in Maita in 1000 or at any time approximately a large company to witness the putting. When the curtain went down on the first act City were broken. The city's glass bill will yesterday afternoon after the defendant in Culme-Seymour's family never went to Malta affoat of the largest British battleship that of Mr. Mason's new play it went down on amount to at least £100,000. The shock of the The King v. E. F. Mylius had been found guilty and sentenced to 12 months' imprisonment Queen. The Malta registers of marriage had for publishing criminal libels on the King:--

I am authorized by his Majesty to state publicly that he was never married except to the Queen, and that he never went through any ceremony of marriage except with the Queen; and further that he would have attended to give evidence to this effect had he not received advice from the Law Officers of the Crown that it would be unconstitutional for him to do so.

PUBLIC INTEREST IN THE CASE.

Although before it came on for hearing little had been said about the case which packets of the Liberator by the defendant inadequate. Ladies in many cases had perforce what came out almost as soon as the curtain occasioned this spontaneous declaration on having been given by detective officers, the part of his Majesty, there can be no doubt called, and gave evidence as to the dates at short of disgraceful. of the interest taken in the hearing by all which he and his family were at Malta, bearsections of the community. The Court was ing out the Attorney-General's opening state- make use of an invalid chair, received the Arch- had been acquitted. But what we were not so crowded to its utmost capacity, and outside ment. His younger daughter died in Novem-bishop of Canterbury and Mrs. Randall David-well prepared to learn was the ground of the its walls the proceedings were eagerly followed in the evening papers, which published very full reports as the trial progressed. The result the King in 1879, when she was eight followed in the evening papers, which published very full reports as the trial progressed. The result the King in 1879, when she was eight followed in the evening papers, which published very full reports as the trial progressed. The result the King in 1879, when she was eight followed in the equition of the daughter, Mrs. Napier, had been found guiltless of her the King in 1879, when she was eight followed in the equition of the daughter and two others which were near her—namely, and tw was made known shortly before 3 o'clock in years old. She had never met him again till group of guests soon gathered. It included the afternoon. the afternoon.

The case was heard before the Lord Chief Justice and a special jury in the Lord Chief that Lady Culme-Seymour's state of health Justice's Court. The hearing began at 10.30, was such that it would be dangerous for her but all available places were occupied soon to appear and give evidence. desired to follow the proceedings. The Court, ments She certainly would have known if which is one of the largest in the Royal Courts her sister had contracted a marriage. Her Whitaker Thompson (Chairman of the London Mrs. Ballantyne came to be acquitted. But we, the are wainscotted half-way up with oak carved only adornment of the Court, the curtains modated with seats behind those reserved for the marriage registers of Malta. counsel. In the Judge's private gallery were many ladies, among whom was Mrs. Winston Churchill The Home Secretary, who followed Churchill The Home Secretary, who followed the birds in which it was denied that the conducted the brief in which it was denied that the conducted the brief in private gallery were published in Reynolds's Newspaper on October 30, is a letter benediction and a hymn.

Sir Arthur Bigge spoke to a statement service which is ordered for the launching of his Majesty's ships, which closes with a perjury, seeing that if it had never been uttered benediction and a hymn. counsel for the Crown, on the solicitors' bench, present Queen. and beside him was Sir Charles Mathews, Director of Public Prosecutions. Sir Arthur Bigge, one of the King's Private Secretaries, arrived just before the Court opened and sat beneath the Bench.

THE DEFENDANT MYLIUS.

The defendant Mylius entered the Court unobserved and took his place on the solicitors' General himself, usually called ex officio informahair. He was neatly dressed in black.

accent, conducted his case in person. He pre- and made affidavits. served his composure throughout the hearing, and during the Attorney-General's opening speech was once or twice observed to smile. He took but little part in the proceedings, and refrained from cross-examining a single Nor did he call any witnesses on his own behalf, though he desired to call the King. This, however, was ruled out of order by the

THE HEARING.

on the Judge's stating that he could make no order | charges at that time, he next inquired whether the King was present. He demanded his Majesty's maximum sentence he could inflict if he did not presence on the grounds, first, that every accused | treat the libels as consecutive-namely, that ' person had the right to be confronted with his of 12 months' imprisonment. accuser in Court; secondly, that no action for libel was usually taken without the prosecutor's ' being in Court where the jury could see him; [A full report of the trial is published on pp. 6 and thirdly, that there was no proof that the prosecutor was at present alive.

The Lord Chief Justice reminded the defendant that this had already been the subject of an application before his Lordship, and that the defendant was perfectly aware that the King could not be summoned. The jury were then sworn, and

counsel for the Treasury, stated that there received Mr. Tom Sopwith after the airman were three counts against the defendant, had made a flight from Brooklands to the The first was that he published a libel con- Castle, round which he circled. cerning the King on November 29, 1910; the second that he published the same libel on' December 19; and the third that he published another libel on the latter date. The defendant publication was for the public benefit.

The Attorney-General then opened the case for the Crown. Speaking in grave and measured an information filed by him in his official capacity for a libel of a grave and serious character reflecting on the King, attacking him in his honour, and reflecting upon him so as to lower him in the esteem and respect of all honourable and right-minded citizens. The libel was contained in leaflets published November and December in a journal pamphlet called the Liberator, which was devoted to the spread of Republican ideas. any observations of a Republican character. circulated in this country an attack on the King! in July, 1893. He had asserted that that was a sham and shameful marriage, a bigamous marriage, and an offence against the Church, for the reason that the King in 1890, while at Malta, married the daughter of an admiral The suggestion made was that the King having contracted that marriage and having had offspring by it, had, in the words of the libel "foully abandoned" the lady whom he had married in 1890 in order that he might marry a Princess under the Royal Marriages Act. so that there might be a valid marriage. These statements were printed in Paris in the Liberator, published monthly in that city by one Edward Holden James. From Paris copies distributed throughout this country.

was not the slightest vestige of truth in any of the statements complained of. The defendant had come into association with James through en Indian named Krishnavarma living in Paris, and the defendant was really responsible for the distribution of the Liberator in this country. to him the opportunity of setting up the the Palace before luncheon.

defence that what he had said was true. The the matter there, but would call evidence utterly to refute these charges. The Sovereign had not the right to vindicate his character by repudiating on oath before a Judge and jury any libellous statements made against him. His incapacity was an absolute incapacity attached to his Sovereignty by the Constitution for reasons of public policy, and there had

It would be proved that the King was never in Malta in 1890 or at any time approaching Shipbuilding, and Engineering Company had been brought to this country, and not only of the ceremony had attracted to Canning had a gun in her hand. The man was a was there no record of such a marriage as alleged, Town an unusually large crowd of sightseers. loathsome brute. The woman's life with but there was no marriage of anybody of the The streets outside the yard were crowded with him had been slavery, degradation, physical The explosion at Jersey City occurred at the name of Seymour recorded in those registers. enthusiastic spectators. A most emphatic denial of the rumours circulated about the previous marriage had been given by Sir A. Bigge in a statement published borate arrangements for their guests to see an act of self-defence. Indeed, it was hardly to the extent of thousands of dellars was done in Reynolds's Newspaper on October 30, 1910, the launch. Roomy stands had been erected possible to suppose that she had not shot him. yet the defendant, with knowledge of that denial, on both sides of the vessel, and two bands were For it was evidently a case of one life or another. published these statements in November in attendance. Although invitations must have The drunken brute had a revolver in his and December. In conclusion the Attorney- been lavishly distributed, yet the ceremony pocket, and in his rage must have killed the General, speaking with great impressiveness, was somewhat marred by the discomfort the woman if she did not get her shot in first—and said that the protection of the jury was sought visitors, especially the ladies, had to suffer it is not the habit of playwrights to sacrifice it was sought for the honour of the King.

THE EVIDENCE. Admiral Sir Michael Culme-Seymour was

The defendant did not cross-examine.

after the doors opened at 10 o'clock, and there Mrs. Napier, the next witness, gave evidence was not even standing room for those who in the same sense as that given by her father. Edward Ward, Sir Edward Henry, Sir Albert swarthy arm thrust under the tent that very desired to follow the proceedings. The Court, She spoke of her own and her sister's move-

Evidence was also given by Admiral Culmein Gothic fashion. Behind the Bench the Seymour's three sons in disproof of the charges; Knight, Sir Charles Wakefield, Sir R. Rogers, saw the lean swarthy arm. We know that, Royal Arms stand out in bold relief as the by Mr. Charles Walker, head of the Commission and Warrant Branch of the Admiralty, as to of the neighbouring boroughs were present in Ballantyne thought he saw was not a real arm, in a ferry-boat which was passing at the time and hangings of which are of dark green. Azopardi, Crown Advocate at Malta, the last There was a large attendance of representa- witness speaking as to the absence of any tives of the Press, many of whom were accom- record of such a marriage as that alleged in

Churchill. The Home Secretary, who followed written by him, in which it was denied that the the proceedings throughout, sat in front of King had ever been married to any one but the

these witnesses.

THE DEFENDANT'S CONTENTION.

The defendant, who announced his intencriminal informations filed by the Attorney looking its best. The huge grey tions; and, secondly, those filed by the King's from its stern. Everything was ready; him for seditious libel; but if, as the Attorney- that was to start the Thunderer upon

and, after some further argument, the Defendant contended that as the Court or the sworn testimony of the King, it had no jurisdiction, and he refused to proceed further. The Judge reminded the defendant that he had expressed an intention to call evidence. The defendant replied that the King was the

witness he wished to call. This evidence being disallowed, the Judge When the Lord Chief Justice had taken his proceeded to sum up. At the conclusion of had a speed of 10 miles an hour. place the defendant first asked for the return the summing up the jury, without leaving the of his private letters which had been seized; and, box, found a verdict of Guilty on all three

The Lord Chief Justice then passed

The Court then rose.

THE KING AND AVIATION.

MR. SOPWITH AT WINDSOR.

The King's interest in aviation was demon-Mr. S. A. T. Rowlatt, one of the junior strated yesterday, when at Windsor his Majesty

won the Baron de Forest prize of £4,000 for the longest flight from England on to the said that the libels were true, and that their Continent in December last, had received a request from the King that he should fly to Windsor Castle, and accordingly started from Brooklands, where his machine was housed. destinies had this, the greatest of battleships effect on the house last night was overwhelming, tones he said that the charge was brought upon He has given the following account of his yet launched for the British Navy, before her ! and the actress, as well as the actor, was

I left Brooklands in a thick fog at I o'clock this afternoon, having been informed by telephone that at preservation of peace. Windsor it was quite clear. Between Brooklands! and Chertsey it was impossible to see the ground from in a greater altitude than 150ft., but I found Staines quite clear. Thence onwards it was beautifully clear. Rising to a height of 1,000ft. I obtained beautiful view of Windsor Castle in the distance, The prosecution, however, was not in respect of but alighted on the golf links at Datchet about 1.20 on account of my radiators being badly frost-bitten It was brought because the defendant had and leaking water. Having lunched, I left Datchet five minutes before 3 o'clock, and, as previously in respect of his marriage with the Queen arranged, flew across the Home Park, encircling Windsor Castle, and passing almost over the Round

> I alighted on the golf links below the Eastern Terrace. Here I was presented to the King. Majesty inspected the machine with the greatest possible interest. Returning to Datchet later in the afternoon, I learnt that the fog at Brooklands was thicker than when I left, so decided to leave the machine there until to-morrow, when I shall make the return journey to Brooklands.

The King was waiting to receive Mr. Sopwith when he alighted on the Royal golf links, and his Majesty was accompanied by his younger Thunderer was safely berthed at Dagenham. sons, who were greatly delighted to see the of the Liberator were sent to the defendant to be flight. Mr. Sopwith was presented to the King by Sir Charles Cust. His Majesty congratulated The Attorney-General having read the the young airman on his winning the Baron de

THE KING AND QUEEN.

A number of letters from James to the de- to-day, and will be in residence at Buckingham launches have been ruined by the freezing of the the electrical services on the South London General pointed out that the charge made Palace for some little time. According to grease. The insurances effected on the hull and Railway. They had regained in the first year machinery are believed to amount approximately of the electrification nearly the whole of the

prosecution, however, were not content to leave THE THAMES DREADNOUGHT. LAUNCH OF THE THUNDERER

AT BLACKWALL.

(BY OUR SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT.) The Thunderer, the first vessel of the Dread-Richard Hazlewood never been any precedent for the calling of the nought type to be built on the Thames, was Robert Pettifer .. Sovereign into the witness-box. The other launched yesterday afternoon from the Black- Baram Singh witnesses, however, would be sufficient to show wall yard in full view of many thousands. Stella Ballantyne... . The directorate of the Thames Ironworks, Mrs. Pettifer

THE ARRANGEMENTS. in reaching and leaving the company's premises. their heroine in the first act. Nor would the While everything within the yard was all public allow them to do it if they were so that both hosts and guests could have desired, foolish as to want to. Evidence of the reception and posting of the railway facilities without were distressingly | Everybody, then, was fully prepared to hear to take refuge in guards' vans, and the over- was up on the second act (two years being accompanied by the falling of glass in the

> Colonies), Mr. Sydney Buxton (President of the Board of Trade), Mr. C. F. G. Masterman (Under-Secretary for Home Affairs), the Lord Mayor and the Sheriffs of London in State, Sir John Benn, Sir Laurence Gomme, Sir Henry

THE LAUNCH. It was estimated that the tide would be at The defendant did not cross-examine any of | flood just after 3. As the consecration service | tory are pieced together by degrees in the finished the vessel lay on the cradles with only Sussex village of Little Beding, whither Mrs. her rudders touching the Thames. It was a Ballantyne has come for peace and oblivion into between the London, Tilbury, and Southend beautiful grey winter afternoon. With the of the past. Oblivion, however, is just what she Railway Company and the Midland Railway tion of calling evidence, then addressed the sun showing full above the reach into which the cannot get. For she has fallen in love with Company for the transfer of the entire under-Judge, contending that there were two methods ship was to make her virgin voyage, the Hazlewood, taking of the London, Tilbury, and Southend THE PRINCESS CLEMENTINA. only of procedure in such a case as this—first, great waterway of our capital's commerce was and he with her, and the brother-in-law of Mr. Railway, Company to the Midland Company. looking its best. The huge grey shell Hazlewood, senior, nappens to be a sometime and preference stockholders with a professional eye for flaws in evilissue to debenture and preference stockholders with a professional eye for flaws in evilissue to debenture and preference stockholders with a professional eye for flaws in evilissue to debenture and preference stockholders with a professional eye for flaws in evilissue to debenture and preference stockholders with a professional eye for flaws in evilism to debenture and preference stockholders with a professional eye for flaws in evilism to debenture and preference stockholders with a professional eye for flaws in evilism to debenture and preference stockholders with a professional eye for flaws in evilism to debenture and preference stockholders with a professional eye for flaws in evilism to debenture and preference stockholders with a professional eye for flaws in evilism to debenture and preference stockholders with a professional eye for flaws in evilism to debenture and preference stockholders with a professional eye for flaws in evilism to debenture and preference stockholders with a professional eye for flaws in evilism to debenture and preference stockholders with a professional eye for flaws in evilibrium. to that on which counsel for the prosecution King's Bench Division at the instance of some the signal was given. The slight lady standing Neither old Hazlewood nor his legal brother tion in the Midland Railway Company prowere seated. He is a young man, apparently private individual. The course adopted by before the prow wished success to the ship and about 30 years of age, rather under the medium the Attorney-General in laying an ex officio her company. With a graceful sweep of an lady until this matter of her innocence has been ordinary stockholders of £240 Midland Railheight and with small features and black information was correct if they were trying embossed silver knife she severed the cord General had stated, he was being tried for watery destinies. The great weights fell away. The defendant, who, despite the foreign defamatory libel, it was an improper course, There was a crash and creaking of the cradles. appearance of his name, speaks with an English and the King ought to have appeared in Court Then two or three muffled sounds from the hydraulic rams. She did The Judge ruled against the defendant, moment of suspense and then the workmen with their hands upon her sides shouted, "She moves.". For a second the movement was not refused to require the filing of the affidavits perceptible. Then at 3.12 the great mass was in slow motion. Rapidly it gathered way. Mrs. Randall Davidson swung the decorated bottle of wine against the stem and Thunderer glided onwards to the element that papers, we all know perfectly well what those is to be her home. It was an impressive moment. The vessel gathered momentum at Mrs. Ballantyne, come to clear up everything. a great pace, and as she entered the water she

With the disappearance of the huge hull from the foreground the bands played "Rule Britannia" and everybody cheered, yet seemed that the vast majority were too impressed to cheer wildly. There seemed such little water room for the ship in the reach. Would the great check hawsers hold her? Two of them seemed to part. remained. It held. The ship was stopped. and then veered a little to the tide. before it could be realized the Thunderer had been put affoat. One of the craftsmen and no longer has any such feeling for Thresk; below the launching platform, as he stood watching the vessel upon which he had privately a week ago. And again she pleads worked so long, exclaimed, "She sits water like a duck." The launch took exactly insists—and old Hazlewood, awakened by the two minutes and 45 seconds.

her to the berth at Dagenham, where she is to interruption—and she agrees to make full be completed. As the Thunderer, riding upon avowal to Dick on the morrow. This is the an even keel, disappeared into the dim shadows great scene of the play—a scene of prolonged of the murky Thames one could not help think- torture for the woman—and, though Mr. Mr. Sopwith, who, it will be remembered, ing of the future. Of the many thousands Alexander bears his share in it gallantly enough, | UOO present at the launch, the writer was of the the brunt of it, of course, falls on Miss Ethel infinitesimal few who have seen a modern Irving, who makes of it a wonderfully poignant TITLE THEATRE. battleship stripped lean for actual war. He thing. She coaxes and fawns, laughs and L. John-street, Adelphi. has seen ships from these very slips with cries, passionately entreats, fiercely revolts, their battle flags flying and their great guns is always at high nervous tension—a deeply engaged in the cruel work of conflict. What pathetic, exquisitely fascinating figure. Let us hope with those who made speeches at called before the curtain again and again. the ceremony that her future may lie in the Well, the truth is then told to Dick,

THE CLOSING CEREMONY.

Hills gave an interesting history of the work Mr. Lyle have largely contributed to our pleasure. of the Thames Ironworks. The secretary read Mr. Alexander has shown a certain grave Davidson and coupled it with the name of the the play, which cannot be a matter of doubtof his reply, said that he was not going to touch achieving that certainty of success—will be on the great question referred to by the Chair- mainly due to the altogether beautiful and truthman, nor upon the larger question as to what ful performance of Miss Ethel Irving. was meant by the process whereby peace was to be maintained throughout the world. He BRIGHTON could only say that what they had in their hearts, hopes, aspirations, and prayers was that, by adding that bulwark to Britain's security they were doing something to set forward the common good. The Lord Mayor of the London, Brighton, and South Coast 12 also made a short congratulatory speech, at Railway, reported on page 16, under the heading the close of which it was announced that the of "Public Companies,"

A film depicting the launch of the Thunderer was shown on the bioscope at the Coliseum last evening.

UNDERWRITERS AND THE LAUNCH. passages complained of, which asserted that the Forest prize, questioned him as to the Town yesterday were naturally much pleased to Forest prize, questioned him as to the King had married the daughter of Admiral Sir Michael Culme-Seymour, affirmed that there was not the slightest vestige of truth in any of which asserted that the Those underwriters who were not at Canning to the Crystal Palace seconds and mechanism of his aeroplane, and hear that the Thunderer had been launched success whole of the suburban services. The change whole of truth in any of the suburban services. The change whole of truth in any of the suburban services. The change whole of the suburban services are to be built very big lines are to be built very big lin sometimes written, and, as the critical event which would involve a considerable revision of fares, INGSWAY THEATRE. Great Queen-street, W.C. occurs within the currency of the policy covering and there would be important alterations of the construction risks is usually the launch, there is services also, as electric traction would enable always a certain amount of relief expressed when them to be made more rapid and frequent. The King and Queen will come to London these were to some extent influenced by the cold five million more passengers in 1910 than they

The King and Queen will come to London these were to some extent influenced by the cold five million more passengers in 1910 than they

THE CHOCOLATE SOLDIER." Music by Occar Skrays. the vessel is safely in the water. Thus comparatively at an equivalent amount.

ST. JAMES'S THEATRE.

"THE WITNESS FOR THE DEFENCE."

BY A. E. W. MASON. Henry Thresk .. Mr. GEORGE ALEXANDER Stephen Ballantyne Mr. Lyston Lyle Harold Hazlewood . Mr. ALFRED BISHOP Mr. LESLIE FABER .. Mr. G. TREVOR ROLLER .. Miss ETHEL IRVING ... Miss Marie Linden

torture. What happened just after the Jersey Central Railway Pier. The estimates of curtain fell? Did she shoot him? Every the loss of life range from 12 to 25, while Eoxoffice 10 to 10. 161. 5,303 (errard. Seasont and Libraries. The hosts at the ceremony had made ela-body hoped so. It would, of course, have been hundreds of people were hurt both in Jersey

crowding and delay of the trains were little supposed to have elapsed)—that Mr. Ballantype had been found shot, that Mrs. Ballantyne The Chairman, who unfortunately has to had been tried for shooting him, and that she husband's death altogether. A gentleman who had been with the murdered man on the Mr. Lewis Harcourt (Secretary of State for the evening when he was shot, one Mr. Thresk, came forward to say that Mr. Ballantyne had confessed himself to him as going about be unloaded, but only one was actually being in fear of his life. He had a document in his possession compromising certain Hindu agitators Lord Brassey, Admiral the Hon. Sir E. R. (he was an Indian civilian, and was shot in a Fremantle, Sir William Collins Colonel Sir tent in Rajputana); he had seen a lean, County Council), Mr. Cyril Cobb (Vice-Chairman), Mrs. Ballantyne came to be acquitted. But we, the audience, know quite well that Mr. Thresk never and Mr. Deputy Millar Wilkinson. The Mayors like the mongoose in the story, the arm Mr. their robes. There were also several Agents, but a mere delusion of dipsomania. We also General for the Colonies and a contingent of know that Mr. Thresk had been in love with Mrs. officers from both the Admiralty and the Ballantyne before her marriage, had been horri-War Office. Just before 3 o'clock the Bishop fied to find her being ill-treated by her husband, Uity. of Barking conducted the brief impressive and would do anything for her sake. Evithe woman would have been safe of acquittal

on the actual facts. These little fragments of two-year-old hissubjects him to a severe interrogation. Thresk ordinary stock. stiks to his story, and the solicitor is satisfied, The agreement is subject to the approval of demeanour, that his story is not the truth. ment. We are all beginning to long now for the scene that will clear everything up, the scène-à-jaire, which of course must be a private conversation between Thresk and Mrs. Ballantyne.

So, when everybody at Mr. Hazlewood's has gone to bed save Thresk, busy over his taps at the window mean. Of course it is Thresk comes at once to the point. He knows the truth, and she knows that he knows it. And now another person must know her future husband, Dick. She must confess THE BLUE BIRD. everything to him. But she is so afraid of losing Dick that she cannot do it. Then, says Thresk, I must tell the truth, confess that I committed perjury at the trial, and take the consequences. Then afterwards he and she can go away and patch up some sort of a life together. For he A still loves her. The woman is grateful to him for this, but cannot accept the solution. For, in the first place, she loves Dick passionately, and, in the second place, she married Dick Thomas. the to be allowed to hold her tongue. But Thresk noise, comes in. Then the cat is out of the The tugs immediately made her fast to tow had made up her mind to confess before the THE ARCADIANS.

who takes it like a gentleman (he in fact suspected it all along), and After the launch had been successfully last. Some quietly finished acting from Mr. are all allowed to go away happy carried through, Mr. Hills and the directors Valentine and Mr. Bishop, good breezy acting 100 TH PERFORMANCE FEBRUARY 4. entertained their visitors in the tea room. Mr. from Mr. Faber, and clever robust acting from CYRIL MAUDE. congratulatory telegrams from Lord Lansdowne, tenderness in the part of the rather unlucky Mr. Balfour, and Lord Crewe. The Chairman Mr. Thresk, which is of immense value to the then proposed a vote of thanks to Mrs. Randall | general effect of the piece. But the success of Archbishop of Canterbury, who, in the course and it is agreeable to find Mr. Mason at last inces, on SATURDAY EVENING. FEB. 11th, and Every follow-

RAILWAY SUBURBAN SERVICES.

Speaking yesterday at the general meeting

Lord Bessborough, referring to the progress of the works for the electrification of the line to the Crystal Palace, stated that the electrical services would be first and third class only, and that, after giving the matter full consideration, the board had decided that from the begin-

traffic lost to the tramways.

DYNAMITE EXPLOSION IN JERSEY CITY.

DAMAGE AND LOSS OF LIFE. (FROM OUR CORRESPONDENT.)

NEW YORK, FEB. 1. A quantity of dynamite which was being .. Mr. Sydney Valentine transferred between a boat and some cars ... Mr. E. VIVIAN REYNOLDS in Jersey City exploded yesterday afternoon. About 25 men were killed and at least 200 people were injured, while thousands of windows throughout the lower part of New York

DETAILS OF THE ACCIDENT.

All the second of the second o to the extent of thousands of dollars was done to plate-glass windows in the lower part of TH YEAR. Manhattan Island. The Government buildings on Ellis Island, the immigration station on Governor Island, and the army headquarters TETER PAN. of the Department of the East also suffered in a similar way. The explosion was distinctly heard throughout New York City and was accompanied by a quaking of the earth which caused considerable excitement and anxiety, even in localities so remote that the shock was not

The vice-president of the Jersey City Railroad says that a dozen Polish labourers were transferring dynamite from a car to a dynamite boat when the explosion occurred. This boat upwards of a hundred men working on the pier at the time, most of whom were injured. There were two cars filled with dynamite waiting to unloaded when the dynamite blew up. The men engaged in the work were sliding the 50lb. cases in which the dynamite was packed down an inclined plane. Other men were stationed by the slope who were supposed to guide the packages and to prevent them from slipping down with dangerous force. The vice-president's theory is that one of the men so employed might have lost his grip on one of the cases. The pier at that time was packed full of freight, mostly steel-mill products, and owing doubtless to the solid nature of these goods the damage were cut by broken glass and were treated at S the emergency hospital on reaching New York

LONDON, TILBURY, AND SOUTHEND RAILWAY.

PROPOSED TRANSFER TO THE MIDLAND COMPANY.

A provisional agreement has been entered

in-law would like young Dick to marry the ducing an equal return, and the issue to the VAUDEVILLE THEATRE. cleared up beyond all doubt, and accordingly way 21 per cent. consolidated perpetual preits they concert a little plot for getting Mr. Thresk ference stock in exchange for each £100 of down to Little Beding, where the solicitor London, Tilbury, and Southend Railway

though it is quite plain to us, from Thresk's the shareholders of both companies and Parlia-

"CONCERTS" and "VARIETIES" will be

found on page 1.

THEATRES, &c. TAYMARKET THEATRE. Lessee and Manager—FREDERICK HARRISON.
Director—HERBERT TRENCH.

This week only. Twice Daily, at 2 and 8.
FINAL PERFORMANCES SATURDAY NEXT, FEB. 4. To-day, at 2 and 8. With a new act, "THE PALACE OF HAPPINESS."
By Maurice Maeterlinck. "AMAZINGLY BEAUTIFUL."---Punch, 1910.

WEDNESDAY EVENING NEXT. Feb. 8th. 2t 7.20 o'clock (subsequent evenings at 8) LL THAT MATTERS. A new and original Comedy of English Tale, by Charles McEvoy.

Mr. E. Lyall Swete, Mr. C. V. France, Mr. Charles Mande, Mr. Fisher White, Mr. Norman Trevor, Mr. Norman Fage, Mr. H. R. Hignett, Mr. E. A. Warburton, Miss Carlotta Addison, Miss Agnes Thomas, Miss Sydney Fairbrother, Miss Helen Haye, Miss Clare

FIRST MATINÉE SATURDAY, FEB. 11. Seats can now be booked. HAVMARK TO-NIGHT, at Lessee and Manager, EOBERT COURTNELDGE.

DAN ROLYAT FLOBENCE SMITHSON QOQTH PERFORMANCE TO-NIGHT. MATINEE EVERY WEDNESDAY, at 2

Telephone, Gerrard 6665, 6367. GERTRUDE KINGSTON, Tel., City 4927. THE SALOON. By HENRY JAMES.

PERFORMANCE TO-NIGHT. By Cicely Hamilt MATTNEE (both plays). WEDNESDAYS & SATURDAYS, 2.30 CAUSERIE DU JEUDI, TO-DAY (Thursday), at 3.30. Miss. LOIE FULLER on LIGHT and DANCING.

THE PLAYHOUSE. CYRIL MAUDE. 25 Inst Two Weeks. A SINGLE MAN. Lost Two Weeks. Mr. By Hubert Henry Davies.

CYRIL MAUDE.
HILDA TREVELYAN. NANCY PRICE. MATINEE EVERY WEDNESDAY and SATURDAY, at 2.30 AUR LITTLE CINDERELLA. Owing to the enormous success and the numerous inquiries for an Evening Production of this musical extravaganza Mr. Cyril Hande has decided to reproduce it for a limited number of perform-

MARGERY MAUDE as "CINDERELLA."
Box-office, 10 to 10. Tels., 14042, 14043 Central; \$970 Gerrard. RITERION.—Lesses, Sir Charles Wyndham. TO-NIGHT, at 9.0. LAST TWO NIGHTS. MATRIMONY A FAILURE

At 8.30. Miss Dorothy Variet at the Piano.

Box-office 10 to 10.

Tel. Gen. DELPHI THEATRE. Mr. GEORGE EDWARDES New Musical Play, in Three Acts, By James T. Tanner. Music by Lionel Monckton.

MATINÉE EVERY SATURDAY, at 2. Box-office open 10 to 10. Tels. 2645 and 8886 Gerrard. TALY'S THEATRE, Leicester-square. TO-NIGHT and EVERY EVENING, at 8.
Mr. GEORGE EDWARDES'
New Production of WALTZ DREAM.

NIGHTLY, at 8.30. LAURENCE IRVING and MABEL Concerts, &c.
HACKNEY in THE UNWRITTEN LAW (Last weeks).
Matines Weds and Sats., 2.30. Tel. Gentard 4.032
LAST WEEKS.
LAST WEEKS.
Entertainments
Fitts. Chambers,

YRIC.—Lessee, Mr. William Greet. TO-NIGHT, at MATINEE KVERY WELNESDAY and SATURDAY at 280. Miss HORNIMAN'S MANCHESTER REPERTORY COMPANY.

FEB. 6. Three weeks season.

First week, THE CRITIC (Standar).

Second week, THE KNIGHT OF THE BURNING PESTIE.

THEATRES, &c. (continued).

Managing Director, Arthur Collins.
TO-DAY, at 1.30, and EVERY EVENING, at 7.30. MATINEES MON. WED. THURS. SAT., 1.30.

JACK AND THE BEANSTALK. PANTOMINE GEORGE GRAVES
HARRY PANDALL
GRORGE BARRETT
GRORGE BARRETT
BARRY LUPINO
BOX-OFFICE OPEN ALL DAY. Tels. 2588 (two lines) Ger.

TIIS MAJESTY'S THEATRE. Proprietor, Sir Herbert Beerbohm Tree. TO-NIGHT and EVERY EVENING, at 8.

Mr. GEORGE ALEXANDER. TO-NIGHT and EVERY EVENING, at 830. A new Piny by A. E. W. Mason.
Mr. GEORGE ALEXANDER. Mr. Alfred Bishop Mr. Leslie Faber Mr. E. Vivian Reynolds Mr. Sydney Valentine Mr. Lyston Lyle Miss Marie Linden

MATINEE WEDNESDAY NEXT at 2.30. and every Wednesday and Saturday following. THE OF YORK'S THEATRE, St. Martin's-lane, W.C.
Sole Lessee and Manager, CHARLES FROHMAN.

7TH YEAR

LAST FIVE PERFORMANCES THIS SEASON. TO-DAY, at 2. TO-NIGHT, at 8. CHARLES FRUHMAN By J. M. BARRIE. -- 2S PETER PAIL

and all the favourite players. LAST TWO MATINEES THIS SEARON. TO-DAY and SATURDAY Next. at 2 TAUKE OF YORK'S THEATRE.

MONDAY NEXT. Feb. 6th, at 8.30.
CHARLES FROHMAN
IRENE VANBRUGH
in GRACE.
By W. Somerset Maugham. For a limited number of performances only.

Box-office daily, ten to ten.

MATTNEES THURSDAYS and SATURDAYS, at 2.30. CHARLES FROHMAN, Sole Lessee and Manager. Under the Management of CHARLES FROHMAN. NIGHTLY, at 8.30. MATINEE SATURDAYS, at 2.30. FRANK CURZON'S production. BEAU BROCADE. Romantic Play by Baroness Orczy and Montagu Parstow. OMEDY THEATRE

Sole Lessee and Manager, Arthur Chudleigh. CHARLES MACHINAN ARTHUR CHUDLEIGH TRESERVING MR. PANMURE.

ARTHUR PINERO. ARTHUR PLAYFAIR DION BOUCICAULT EDMUND MAURICE DAWSON MILWARD

CAVOY THEATRE. Miss MARIE BREMA'S Season. Under the Patromage of H.R.H. PRINCESS CHRISTIAN. TO-NIGHT and SATURDAY EVENING, at 8.

MARIE BREMA Will give lest two performances of EMANUEL MOOR'S TO-NIGHT, at 8. TATEDDING BELLS POMPADOUR Miss BREMA will sing THE PRINCIPAL ROLE in BOTH OPERAS.
Between the Two Operas will be given

WATER DANCE Arranged by Miss Marie Brems. Box-office 10 to 10. Telephone, Gerrard 2502. OUEEN'S THEATRE. Mr. H. B. IRVING. EVERY EVENING. at 8.15.

MATINÉES WEDNESDAYS and SATURDAYS, at 2.30. By George Pleydell and A. E. W. Mason, from A. E. W. Mason, Clementing."

Tele., 3815 Gerrard. Under the Management of Messis. A. and S. GATTI.

Mr. GEORGE EDWARDES'
New Musical Production in Two Acts: THE GIRL in the TRAIN. ("Die Geschiedene Fran.")

MATINEE EVERY WEDNESDAY, at 2.15. POLLO THEATRE, Shaftesbury-avenue, W Henry Lowenield, Sole Proprietor.
Tom B. Davis, Sole Lessee and Manager.
TO-DAY, 230 and 8.80. Mats., THURS., SATS., at 2.80.
THE FOLLLES

in Vandevilles. Burlesques. Gestronomic Quartettes, 2 "VOICE TRIAL." & PELISSIER'S POTTED PAGEANT. Tel., \$243 G. PRINCE OF WALES THEATRE Under the Management of Frank Curzon. TO-NIGHT, at 8.45.
Mr. CHARLES HAWTREY'S production
(By arrangement with Charles Frohman).
INCONSTANT GEORGE.

Preceded, at 8.10. by "The Portrait," by Dora Bright, TEW THEATRE. Tel. Gerrard 2473. Proprietor, Sir Charles Wyndham. Under the Management NEILSON

TO-NIGHT (Thursday), at 8, will be produced THE POPINJAY. MATINEE EVERY WEDNESDAY and SATURDAY, at 2.30. CTRAND THEATRE, Aldwych. Tel 3830 Gerr. TO-DAY, at 2.30. EVERY EVENING, at 8.50.

Mr. Arthur Hardy

VICE VERSA, by F. Anstey.

LAST THREE NIGHTS

109th PERFORMANCE. LAST THREE NIGHTS 109th PERFORMAN LAST TWO MATS., TO-DAY and SAT., at 2.30. THE SPECKLED BAND, an adventure of SHERLOCK HOLMES; by Arthur Conan Doyle,

will be revived on Monday Evening Next. Feb. 6th. at 8.30.
Mr. LYN HARDING in his OHIGINAL PART. ARRICK.—OSCAR ASCHE & LILY BRAYTON. Lessees. Arthur Bourchier and Herbert Sleath.
TO-DAY, at 2.30, and EVERY EVENING, at 8.15.
COUNT HANNIBAL.

Stanley Weyman.
OSCAR ASCHE and LULY BRAYTON. MATINEES WEEKLY-WEDS., THURS., and SATS., at 2.30:

TATYNDHAM'S.—Under the Management of Frank Curzon and Gerald du Maurier. TO-NIGHT, at 8.30. GERALD du MAURIER in a new Play. By George Paston.

MATINEE EVERY WEDNESDAY and SATURDAY, at 2.30:

TO OYAL COURT THEATRE.-Prop.Mr. J. H. Leigh. Miss LILLAH McCARTHY'S MATINEES TO-MORROW (red. 3), and FEB. 7, 10, 14, 17, at 2.30. THE WITCH. A Drama, in tour acts, by H. Wiers-Jessen.
English Version by John Masefield. The Play produced by Granville Barker. YCEUM.-CINDERELLA.-TWICE DAILY, at

2s. 6d. Special matinee prices for children, except Pit and Gallery. Box-office Phone 7617-8-9 Ger. (3 lines). FUNNIEST PANTO-MIME IN LONDON. INTRICT MESSENGERS for OFFICES in all parts of London: at the principal London Rail-vay Termini, and at THE TIMES BOOK CLUB. Telephone, Gerrard 1023. Telegrams. Opponents. London.



THIS DAY, at 2.30 and 8.30, VICE VERSA: Messes, Charles Rock, O. P. Heggie, Frederick Volpé, Walter Ringham, Leveson Lane, Brian Egerton, Brisco Owen, and Spencer Trevor: Masters Philip Tonge, Hereward Knight, F. Thorndike, J. Hobbs, J. Victor & Sperwood, B. Hampden, &c.: Misses Phyllis Embury, M. Taverner, L. Brennan, J. Bloomfield, A. Glynne, Marjorie Dane.

QUEEN'S THEATRE. SHAFTESBURY-AVENUE, W.

THIS EVENING, at 8.15. THE PRINCESS CLEMENTINA:
Mr. H. h. Irving, Miss Stella Patrick Campbell, Miss Dorothea
Esird: Messis. Norwood, Playfair, Tyars, Pertuis, Vibart, Lloyd,
Ruston, Whitby, Curwen, Curtis, Howlett, Reynolds: Misses Helen Rous, Grace Croft, Mary Foster. INDEX ADVERTISEMENTS.

Marshail, Sir Herbert, and

Ritz-Carlton Hotel Hayman Christy and Lilly Ltd. Horses, Carriages, &c. 2 The Times Book Cinb
Hospital Nurses 1 Trades
Hotels 2, 10, & 12 Treloar and Sons. 11 1