

## MR. LABOUCHERE'S FIGHT.

THE CHARGES MADE IN HIS PLEA IN MR. LAWSON'S LIBEL SUIT.

LONDON, March 19.—In the Lawson-Labouchere libel case, now on trial in the Court of Queen's Bench, Mr. Labouchere's plea in justification of his allegation that Mr. Lawson is a disgrace to journalism covers 55 folio pages. He declares that the *Daily Telegraph* (Mr. Lawson's paper) is conducted professedly on Liberal principles, but in fact solely for the pecuniary and personal advancement of the prosecutor of this suit; that the prosecutor, in order to obtain information from official sources, and thus give his paper the appearance of being the official Liberal organ, published servile, fulsome flatteries respecting Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Bright and other Liberals; that when the Liberals quitted office he published false and defamatory articles respecting Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Bright, with the like intent of obtaining pecuniary and social advantages, and extracts from articles inserted by the prosecutor similarly abused and flattered Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Salisbury when out of and in office; that the prosecutor habitually printed obscene and immoral advertisements, and charged extra tariff for them, and, while printing them, published articles denouncing the mischief caused by such advertisements; that the prosecutor habitually published baby-farming advertisements, charging extra for them, while editorially denouncing baby-farming; that the prosecutor habitually extolled the Christian religion, though he did not believe in it, the articles on the subject being prompted by sordid motives; that the prosecutor published letters wholly or partly written in London, purporting to be from Paris; that the prosecutor changed his name to conceal the fact that he is a Jew, and because he is ashamed of the name of Levy; that the prosecutor was angry and felt insulted because attention was drawn to the fact that his family was once poor, and, being determined to take a mean and cowardly revenge, he armed himself with a stick and lay in wait in a dark street and attacked the defendant from behind; that he referred the defendant's second to the prosecutor's second to arrange a duel, and, after having it supposed he was willing to fight, he consulted the ladies of his family and Mr. Edwin Arnold and then refused to fight; that the prosecutor published false accounts of this assault, and that the prosecutor is ignorant.

The cross-examination of Mr. Labouchere, directed to establishing the above plea, takes about the same range as on the former hearing of the case before Sir Robert Carden. It is really a duel of wits between Lawson and Labouchere. From the observations of Lord Chief-Justice Coleridge, Mr. Labouchere seems to have the best of it. The case was adjourned from yesterday until Monday.

**The New York Times**

Published: March 20, 1881

Copyright © The New York Times