The True Witness AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

VOL. XXXII.—NO. 44. MONTREAL, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 14, 1882. PRICE FIVE CENTS

THE INFORMER CASE!

THE "POST" LIBEL SUIT.

The Court of Queen's Bench. CRIMINAL SIDE.

[*Chief-Justice* SIR A. A. DORION *presiding*.]

Present for the Crown—C. P. DAVIDSON, Q.C., and J. A. OUIMET, Q. C.

M'NAMEE V. WHELAN.

Wednesday, June 7.

On the re-assembling of the Court this morning, Mr. Barry asked that he be allowed until Friday to fyle his reply to the plea entered by the defence yesterday.

Mr. Doherty opposed the application and stated that the defence was anxious that the trial should come off as soon as possible, and expressed his surprise that Mr. Barry, from his remarks in Court a few mornings ago, should make any application for delay. The application was granted.

It is now the general impression, judging from what has taken place in Court, and the *laches* and delays and demurres, by the plaintiff's attorneys that they do not want a trial this session, if at all. This opinion has prevailed for the past few months, and it now looks as if the opinion was correct. If Mr. McNamee is in earnest in demuring it is, it is said, a sure sign he does not want a trial, else why throw such obstacles in the way. Why demur at all? Why not be anxious to arrive at the truth? The defendant is anxious for a trial, he has gone to considerable expense to procure witnesses; he has tried to force the issue; the plaintiff has also expressed, by his counsel, a wish for a complete *expose*. Why, then, these demurrers and *laches* and delays? These are the questions heard on the streets to-day on all sides by the general public, which has taken such an intense interest in this celebrated case. One gentleman—a French Canadian—remarked this morning: "I am profoundly astonished at the course taken by the plaintiff. I have had my doubts, but they are dispelled.

FRIDAY, June 9.

THE PROSECUTION FYLE A DEMURRER TO THE PLEA OF JUSTIFICATION—THE CASE EVIDENTLY NOT TO BE FOUGHT ON ITS MERITS.

THE POST libel case came up again in Court this morning. This time the prosecutor plays another card, which will necessarily cause another delay before the merits of the case are gone into.

A few minutes after the Chief Justice had taken his seat on the bench Mr. T. W. Ritchie, Q.C., one of the Counsel employed by the prosecutor, Mr. F. B. McNamee, fyled a demurrer to the plea of justification fyled last Tuesday by Mr. C. J. Doherty. The grounds of the demurrer are as follows, as specified in writing and presented to the Court:—

Canada:
Province of Quebec,
District of Montreal.

IN THE COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH.
(CROWN SIDE.)

THE QUEEN

vs.

JOHN PATRICK WHELAN.

[*Indictment for Libel.*]

And the Honorable L. O. Loranger, Attorney-General for the said Province of Quebec of Our Lady the Queen, who prosecutes for our said Lady the Queen in this behalf as to the plea secondly pleaded, and styled "*a further plea*" of the said John Patrick Whelan, by him above pleaded, saith that the same and the matters therein contained in manner and form as the same are above pleaded and set forth, are not sufficient in law to bar or preclude our said Lady the Queen from prosecuting the said indictment against him, the said John P. Whelan, and that our said Lady the Queen is not bound by the law of the land to answer the same; and this he, the said Honorable L. O. Loranger, who prosecutes as aforesaid, is ready to verify.

Wherefore, the said Honorable L. O. Loranger prays judgment declaring the said plea, secondly pleaded by the said John Patrick Whelan, to be insufficient and that the same be rejected.

Montreal, 9th June, 1882.

(Signed.) L. O. LORANGER,
Attorney-General.
J. A. OUIMET, Q.C.,
C. P. DAVIDSON, Q.C.

The argument on this point was fixed for to-morrow. Messrs. Carter, Q.C., Ritchie, Q.C., and D. Barry, appear for the prosecution, and Mr. W. H. Kerr, Q.C., and Mr. C. J. Doherty for the defence.

The impression continues to gain ground that the prosecution does not want a *bona fide* trial in this case. When the proceedings of this morning were over the affair was discussed by knots of outsiders, who agreed that the technicalities brought forward to prevent a trial were signs that the prosecutor did not want the production of witnesses at all. One gentleman, himself a lawyer, said that if the plaintiff was as eager for developments from the witness box as defendant, all would be plain sailing, as also in a case of such vast importance no legal technicalities should be allowed to intervene. "If I were in the plaintiff's place," concluded the gentleman, "I would be intensely anxious for a trial."

"But suppose you were guilty," asked a POST reporter.

"Oh, in that case, I might demur to a plea of justification," was the reply.

Saturday, June 10.

The *cause celebre* of Francis B. McNamee against John P. Whelan, Manager of THE POST, for criminal libel was again before the Court of Queen's Bench this morning. His Honor Chief-Justice Sir A. A. Dorion, presided, Messrs. T. W. Ritchie, Q.C., Edward Carter, Q.C, and Denis Barry appearing for the private prosecution, and Messrs. W. H. Kerr, Q.C., and C. J. Doherty for the defence. Mr. A. Ouimet, Q.C., was present for the Crown.

The prosecutor in the case, Mr. F. B. McNamee, was not in Court, owing to his absence from the city. His presence, from present indications, will not in all probability be required, as the tactics now being adopted by his counsel show plainly enough that it is understood that the objections and legal technicalities now being raised are intended to put back the case until next term. It is altogether unlikely that the true merits will be gone into at this session of the Court owing to the delay caused by the objections to the plea of justification in the shape of the demurrer fyled by Mr. Ritchie yesterday. The general impression is that if Mr. McNamee was so anxious to vindicate his character he would compel the defendant to prove the charges at once.

TO-DAY'S PROCEEDINGS.

On the opening of the proceedings this morning Mr. Carter, in the absence of Mr. Ritchie, asked that the case be adjourned till Mr. Ritchie should arrive.

Mr. KERR for the defence insisted on proceeding at once.

Mr. CARTER for the prosecution contended that the case was fixed for 11 o'clock.

The Hon. Judge said the case had been fixed for ten o'clock.

Mr. CARTER insisted on having the delay, and the defence continuing to resist, Mr. Ritchie arrived, and the Court ordered the argument to proceed.

Mr. RITCHIE opened for the prosecution. He said this indictment is for a libel published in THE POST on the 15th March last. The indictment is under section 2nd of 37 Vic., c 38. The defendant pleaded two pleas, one of "not guilty" and the other of justification. The first charge in the article complained of is that Mr. McNamee was among the first to introduce Fenianism into Montreal, and endeavored to graft it on the St. Patrick's Society.

2nd. That he betrayed his dupes to the Government for money.

3rd. That he was a crimp and a bounty broker.

4th. That he offered money to a person to "put daylight" through another.

The learned Counsel spoke of the gravity of such charges and argued strenuously that according to the English law the defendant was obliged when pleading justification to give specific information of time and place in order that the prosecutor might know how to rebutt the accusation or prove his innocence. The authorities were clear that in a libel where an indictable offence was charged, the same amount of precision should be used in preparing the plea of justification, as if it were the indictment upon which the person accused was to stand his trial. Under the present circumstances there was no other course to be pursued by the prosecution than to demurr to the plea Mr. Ritchie cited various English authorities to the effect that in cases similar to the one before the Court justification should be always specifically and specially pleaded. The prosecutor and not the defendant was on trial and that being virtually the case it could not be expected he was going to clear himself of charges, the character of which he was not fully aware. In the first place no names or time were given in the charge that he induced persons to join the Fenian organization. In the second place no names were given as to who were his dupes by his betrayal of their confidence in giving information to the Government. In the third place, in the charge that he was a crimp and a bounty broker, no names, time or place were mentioned, and lastly, that he had attempted to commission another to commit murder, the name of the party whom he wished to commission was omitted in the plea. On these grounds he contended the plea to be insufficient. He also contended that even if true they were merely individual acts, and were, therefore, not published for the benefit of the public. If they were, the defendant should show in what manner they were to benefit the public. Introducing Fenianism might effect public interests, but he failed to see how bounty-brokerage or offering money to a man to "put daylight through another" did. In the latter case he should, if guilty, be exposed in the legitimate way.

MR. CARTER then cited various authorities from the English law on the subject.

HIS HONOR, however, said there was no difficulty on that particular point, as in the Dr. Newman case the plea had to be renewed three times.

Mr. KERR, Q.C., for the defence, said: This case comes up on a demurrer, the judgment on which, it is hoped, will have the effect of settling the practice as to the proper method of pleading a plea of justification to an indictment for libel. This was peculiarly desirable, inasmuch as in the last two terms of this Court there had been rendered two judgments which were considered contradictory on this question. The question to be decided was whether a plea of justification can be pleaded in general terms, or whether it must necessarily set forth details and particulars. To sustain their objections to the plea as fyled, the eminent counsel for the prosecution depended entirely on English authorities, and not even the most recent English authorities, the cases cited by them being many of them over-ruled even in England. But the learned counsel contended that under our statute the same particularity of pleading was not required as under the English statute, and consequently the authorities cited were inapplicable. He referred to the English Act (Lord Campbell's Act) and the Act of Canada, 37 Vict., c. 38, sect. 6, to show the difference between the two acts. He further cited numerous authorities to show that even in England no such particularity of pleading was required as contended for by the prosecution, and that the most that could be required would be the fyling in addition to the plea of a bill of particulars. The system of special pleading which once had reigned supreme before English Courts had of late years come to be looked upon as a disgrace, and was no longer in vogue the tendency of the recent jurisprudence being towards allowing much greater latitude in pleading. This system of special pleading had in fact come to be an art, and in almost every case it was required to retain a special pleader to draft even the simplest plea, and it had often resulted in burking justice. In this country we had never fallen into that vicious practice. Our statute required merely that there should be alleged "the truth of the matters charged," whereas the English statute went further and required that the truth of such matters should be pleaded with the same particularity as required in pleading a justification to an action for defamation. Unless these latter words were to be taken as having no meaning at all, it was impossible to decide, as the counsel for the prosecution wished to have it decided, that under a statute which studiously avoided inserting them, the same particularity of pleading was to be required as under one where they had been inserted. The learned counsel referred to the cases of the Queen *vs.* Sills, and the Queen *vs.* Baxter, where general pleas had been fyled, and proof allowed and made thereunder, and the case of the Queen *vs.* Cauvier, where it had been found impossible to compress into a special plea all the facts which the defendant wished to offer in support of the general charge made. An attempt had been made to represent that it was for the public benefit that the charges made should be published. Surely no argument was needed to establish that if these charges were true, then it was of the greatest public interest that they should be made public. If this man McNamee had been, as alleged, guilty of introducing Fenianism, and then turning around and basely selling the members of that Society, would it be pretended that his act was one in which the public had no interest? Surely it was of the most vital importance that such a deed should be made known, that such a gangrene in society should be subjected to the cauterizing influence of public opinion. Again, if he had been guilty of bounty-broking and conspiracy during the American war, he had violated a statute the public law of the land.

The CHIEF-JUSTICE—Do you think the principle is universal? For instance, suppose a woman who twenty-five years ago kept a house of ill-fame, to have since reformed and been married and living respectably, do you consider it would be in the public interest that the fact that she had kept such a house thereby violating the law, should be published.

Mr. KERR—No, but the case is hardly parallel. She may have been at one time a "public woman," but cannot have changed and become a "public man." Here we have to deal with a man striving to figure in the latter capacity, posing as a leader of a class in the community, and surely the public interest requires that if such a man be guilty of the serious charges laid at his doors the public should be put on their guard against him, and that portion of the population whom he fain would lead taught what manner of man he is.

Mr. CARTER having said a few words in reply, citing authorities to support the pretensions already advanced by him, the Chief Justice announced that he would give judgment on Tuesday.

Tuesday, June 13.

The Court room was well filled this morning by members of the legal fraternity and spectators to hear the decision of Chief-Justice Dorion on the legal point or objection raised by the prosecution to the special plea fyled by the manager of THE POST. The Hon. Judge went into a lengthy review and discussion of the law of libel as far as the plea was concerned. He eventually ruled that a plea of justification must be specific in regard to the charges made against the person alleged to be libelled. The following is the judgment on the demurrer:—

The parties have been heard on a demurrer to a general plea of justification fyled in answer to an indictment for libel. The article complained of as libellous, was published in THE POST newspaper of the date 15th March last. It is headed "An Indictment," and contains a series of charges against the prosecutor. (The Judge here read the article.) The plea offered to justify this libel, reiterates in identical words the charges themselves, and states that they are true, and that it was for the public benefit that they should be published. The demurrer is general in the form usually followed in England, with the exception that in its conclusions it does not pray for judgment and that a verdict be given in favor of the prosecution as if no such plea had been fyled, as is the custom in England, but merely prays that the plea be declared insufficient and be rejected.

Formerly the defendant on an accusation of libel was not allowed to plead the truth of the charges made as a defence to such accusation, but by the Imperial Statute, 6 and 7 Victoria, known as Lord Campbell's Act, a party accused of libel was permitted to plead as a justification the truth of the charges alleged as libellous; also by that statute it was enacted that in such plea of justification the truth of the charges made should be pleaded in the manner then required in pleading justification in a civil action for defamation, and further that the party should allege the particular facts by reason of which it was for the public interests that such charges should be published. By the English law, the parties in a civil action for defamation were always allowed to plead the truth of a libel, and therefore the provision made in the criminal Statute fixed a precise method of pleading justification in a criminal action, inasmuch as the manner of so pleading in civil matters was well established and understood.

The act also required that the particular facts which made it for the public benefit that the charges should be published, should be specially set forth in the plea. The Queen *vs.* Newman is a striking instance of the precision required in pleading justification in England. In that case the plea of justification was fyled and demurred to and upon the demurrer was amended, and again demurred to and again amended. There is no doubt that according to the English practice all the facts relied upon must be specifically stated in the plea. The rule is laid down in several cases that in a plea of this nature the charges must be stated with the same precision as would be required in an indictment. This point was decided, among other cases, in that of Janson *vs.* Stewart. It was not till 1874 that the law was amended in Canada so as to allow proof of the matters charged in a libel to be offered. This was done by the Act 37 Vict., ch. 38. In adopting this statute the Dominion Parliament followed almost exactly the English Act, but omitted the words "in manner were required in pleading justification to a civil action for defamation," and also the words "requiring that the particular facts, by reason of which it was for the public benefit that the article was published, should be set forth." In this case the defendant contends that it is sufficient to follow the words of the Canadian statute, and states that the matters charged are true, that it was for the public benefit that they were published, and that it is not necessary to give particular facts. The prosecution, on the other hand, maintains that it is necessary, as in England, to do so. It is the first time that this question is directly raised before our Courts. What is to be decided is whether the form of expression of our Statute makes the requirements of the plea different from those under the English Statute. It would have been difficult for our Parliament to refer to any standard of a plea of justification in civil cases, owing to the difference in laws upon that subject in the various Provinces, as also to the fact that in some Provinces such a plea is unknown in civil cases. It would have been equally difficult for the legislature to refer in our act to Lord Campbell's Act as fixing the requirements of such a plea, inasmuch as in England there has been a total change in the practice and mode of pleading since the enactment of Lord Campbell's Act. And to require under our Statute a plea in the form at that time required in English civil cases would have been going backward rather than forward in legislation. Moreover, such a reference would have been to a law not generally understood in this country. Probably these were the reasons for the first omission in our act, but they do not apply to the second omission. However, the reason of it can easily be understood, having omitted the words prescribing the manner of pleading the truth, had the Legislature inserted these words requiring the mentioning of the particular facts which made the publication necessary for the public benefit, it would have led inevitably to the conclusion that it would not be necessary to state the particulars of the facts charged in the libel. I consider our statute, utterly irrespective of the English law, and I am of opinion that the cases cited as having been decided in England do not apply under our statute, but I am of opinion that the statute must be interpreted with reference to the several rules of pleading and evidence. It is a general rule of pleading in our courts that all facts pleaded in *avoidance*, must be so pleaded specifically, and that there must be given in the plea sufficient detail as to time, place and circumstances, to enable the party, to whom such facts are opposed, to meet the same. And it is also a rule of evidence that a party cannot prove any fact which has not been so pleaded. To allow the opposite course to be adopted would be unjust to a complainant. The defendant wishing to justify his conduct is bound to set forth precise facts which he intends to prove as such justification, not with all the technicalities of the English law, but with sufficient precision to enable the opposite party to defend himself.

I am, therefore, of opinion that the plea in the present case is insufficient and that the demurrer should be maintained. However, as this is the first time this question has come up, and as it is one of great importance that jurisprudence should be settled, should the parties express a desire to amend the plea or put in a new one, I would be disposed to grant such application.

Mr. KERR Q.C., then rose and said that, in accordance with the Judge's decision, he would be ready to fyle a plea as required in 48 hours.

Mr. CARTER, Q.C., followed and stated that it was not the intention of the prosecution to create any delays, but that on the contrary they were quite ready and willing to proceed with the trial.

Mr. BARRY also asserted his anxiety to have the case proceeded with.

Mr. KERR Q.C. said he quite understood their position and they would have every opportunity of having a day fixed for the trial on the day after to-morrow.

FRIGHTFUL ACCIDENT.

QUEBEC, June 11.—News has been received here of a frightful accident which occurred at Montmorenci Falls. A farmer named Labergo was driving home his daughter, a married woman, who leaves seven children, when the horse became unmanageable near the bridge on the road which crosses the river. About 300 feet above the falls the vehicle struck the bridge with such violence as to break away the guard, throwing Laberge out upon the bridge, but pitching the woman, horse and cart into the boiling torrent, which immediately swept them over the terrible abyss, a fall of nearly 800 feet. The body of Mrs. Richard was subsequently found at the foot of the falls, near Hall's dam.

IRELAND

IN AND OUT OF PARLIAMENT!

THE LAND WAR

LONDON, June 7.—In the House of Commons, in the debate on the amendment to the Repression Bill offered by Mr. Russell, Liberal, defining intimidation as threats or *acts of violence to person or property*, or incitement thereto, Mr. Dillon defended the system of boycotting, which he advocated in public speeches as within the law. He declared that but for that system, "moonlight" outrages would have begun a year earlier than they did, and would not have begun at all if the Land League had been left at liberty. He admitted that the system of boycotting had been grossly abused for the gratification of private malice.

Sir William Harcourt said the Government were willing to accept any amendment consistent with the putting down of boycotting.

Mr. Cowen, Radical, said he desired the same treatment for Irish tenants as for English trades unionists.

Mr. Gladstone maintained that the bill secured such treatment.

LONDON, June 7.—Davitt in a speech at Liverpool, last night, said he favoured the land becoming national property. He considered that the soil of Ireland could be purchased for the tenants for £140,000,000 in Government bonds, payable in 50 years. He denounced Dublin Castle rule as a monstrous failure.

LONDON, June 8.—The debate on the Repression bill was resumed in the House of Commons to-night.

Mr. Russell's amendments defining intimidation as threats or acts of violence to persons or property, or incitement thereto, was rejected.

Before the vote Sir Wm. Harcourt undertook to insert the words, "providing acts prescribed by this clause must, to be punishable, be done with animus."

Mr. Parnell declared the so-called concession made the clause worse.

The amendment offered by Mr. Parnell, seeking to define intimidation, and limiting it to certain definite acts, was rejected.

Mr. T. P. O'Connor, supporting the amendment, accused the Ministry of imbecility. Objection was made, but the chairman ruled that the language was not unparliamentary.

The news of the murder of Bourke created a sensation in the House of Commons to-night. Mr. Parnell and other Irish members expressed regret at the assassination. They stated that the Land League of Gort district ceased to exist six months ago.

DUBLIN, June 8.—Walter Bourke, a Galway landlord, was shot dead to-day. A soldier, his escort, was also killed. A volley was fired at Bourke and his escort from behind a wall as they were riding near Gort. Both fell dead. Bourke was a magistrate, and son of the late Crown solicitor. He was a barrister, and had amassed a fortune in India. He contested the seat in Parliament for Mayo against Nelson, had disputes with tenants, and recently left London to carry out evictions. A few month ago he entered the church at Carraro with a rifle while mass was being celebrated. The priest ordered him to leave. He escaped by the side door to avoid being mobbed.

CORK, June 9.—Davitt, addressing a meeting this evening, explained that his object in going to America was to make an appeal toward the support of Anna Parnell and the Ladies' League, and contradict the lying rumor of a split in the League.

TROY, N.Y., June 8.—Michael Davitt, the Irish leader, has cabled that he will be in Troy at the festival of the Amalgamated Land League on July 4th.

DUBLIN, June 9.—Large rewards have been offered for the arrest of the murderers of Mr. Bourke and his escort, or information leading thereto. Mr. Bourke's watch and the soldier's rifle were taken by the assassins.

QUEENSTOWN, June 9.—Davitt, addressing a crowd before embarking for America to-day, said the Irish cause was to be won by a strong appeal to justice, not to the wild justice of revenge.

BALLINA, May 9.—The inquest in the case of Melady, shot during a disturbance between the people and the constabulary, has been concluded. Fifteen of the jury returned a verdict of death caused by a gunshot wound inflicted by the Irish Constabulary. The jury expressed sympathy with the relatives of Melady, and recommended the Government to compensate them.

DUBLIN, June 10.—Reports concerning the agrarian crimes have created a profound sensation in Dublin. The Lord Lieutenant and permanent officials were at the Castle until late last night sending instructions to various parts of the country regarding the protection of landlords and officials in danger. The feeling of despondency here was never greater, and the feeling is intensified by the fact that the agricultural prospect through the country is particularly bright. The attempt to assassinate Farmer Brown near Ballina was a work of daring. Six men approached him in a field and asked him why he took the farm when warned not to. Six shots were fired at him. Two bullets lodged in his thigh. Brown was found insensible. He is aged 60 and will probably die. A police patrol passed the scene of the outrage ten minutes before. Four arrests have been made on suspicion. The attempt to murder East, an extensive farmer and mill owner in the County Roscommon was also daring. Three men with blackened faces, carrying heavy bludgeons, jumped over the wall of his barn yard in day time and attacked him savagely. His son came to his assistance but was compelled to flee. East's wife came but the assailants threatened to murder her. The assailants then shot East in the hip, knee and ankle. He is sinking rapidly. Four men were arrested, but he could not identify any.

LONDON, June 10.—Davitt is reported as denying that there is a split in the Land League and Parnell's followers are breaking away from his guidance.

LONDON, June 10.—Three hundred soldiers and police have been drafted into the district where Bourke was shot. The persons arrested have been released.

DUBLIN, June 11.—The Irish bishops have issued an address to their flocks, promising the support of the clergy to the people in peacefully agitating for their rights, but condemning as the worst enemies to the country, the men who recommended illegal courses, particularly those belonging *to secret societies*. The bishops condemn the recent horrible murders, but belive they were due to evictions, which it is the duty of the Government to stop at all cost.

LONDON, June 11.—A Democratic meeting was held in Hyde Park this afternoon to protest against the Repression bill. Thirty thousand were present. Several English and Irish members of Parliament attended. Cowen, Radical member of Parliament, vigorously denounced coercion. The proceedings were orderly.

NEW YORK, June 10.—The *Herald's* London special says:—"The Repression Act grinds its slow way through the Committee debates with dry discussions on law points which threaten to grow interminable. If ever the Government hoped to get the new Coercion Act passed in a hurry, that hope must now begin to vanish. Now and then the Irish members threaten to abandon all further opposition to the measure, but unless something very unforeseen should happen, Parnell and his friends will probably offer steady, relentless opposition to the progress of the bill. There are already over two hundred amendments down on the paper, and as there is practically no limit to the number of amendments and new clauses that may be proposed, the Government may well regard the future with something like dismay. So far there has been admirable temper shown, except in a short passage between Mr. Forster and O'Kelly. Still the temper on both sides is becoming sour, and probably before the end of next week there will be a direct conflict between the Parnellites and the Government. At the same time, public opinion in England is growing very strong against the Prevention of Crime bill, as being far too despotic and wide-reaching. This makes it difficult for the Government to bring their heavy battalions to bear on the Irish party. Davitt's speeches cause a good deal of comment.

LONDON, June 12.—Serious dissensions in the Cabinet are rumored. Sir W. Harcourt insists on carrying the Crime Prevention bill in its most stringent form. Mr. Chamberlain and Sir Charles Dilke take an opposite view. The relations of the members of the Cabinet are becoming daily more strained, and a break up is regarded as among the immediate probabilities. It is said Mr. Chamberlain and Sir Charles Dilke are contemplating resignation. Neither Mr. Chamberlain nor Sir Charles Dilke has ever spoken in support of the Crime Prevention bill, and their silence causes curious comment. It is also noticed that both in the House and lobbies they maintain a sympathetic, even friendly, attitude toward Mr. Parnell.

DUBLIN, June 12.—In consequence of the statement of Mr. Gladstone in the House of Commons that he had received no remonstrance from the Irish judges against the provisions of the Repression bill, the judges held a private meeting and passed resolutions protesting against trials being held by a commission of three judges without juries. In order to avoid further misapprehension, the judges forwarded the resolutions to the official residence of Mr. Gladstone. In the event of the bill passing with its obnoxious provisions, Baron Fitzgerald will resign. It is generally understood that when the bill passes, Mr. William Johnson, Attorney-General for Ireland, will be raised to the bench.

LONDON, June 12.—The number of suspects now imprisoned is 263.

LIMERICK, June 12.—The Corporation has conferred the freedom of the city on Davitt.

THE LORDS.

LONDON, June 12.—In the House of Lords this afternoon, Earl Granville stated that Admiral Seymour was empowed to land sailors at Alexandria if necessary.

The House by 128 to 132, refused to order the bill legalizing marriage with a deceased wife's sister, to a second reading.

THE COMMONS.

Mr. Trevelyan, replying to Mr. O'Kelly, said John Gannon had been offered his release if he engaged to go to America. Having refused this condition he could not be released.

Consideration of the Repression bill was resumed.

Mr. Healy moved in amendment that exclusive dealing be not considered intimidation.—Rejected.

Clause four, dealing with and defining intimidation, was adopted. Clause five, concerning riots and other offences, was taken up, the section declaring that any person who takes part in any riot or unlawful assembly shall be guilty of an offence against this Act, was adopted.

Mr. Chamberlain said he had referred the subject of spurious cheese from America, made from lard, to the Departmental Committee. He thought the Administration act would deal with the question of its sale.

The Home Rulers to-night decided not to offer any systematic obstruction to the Repression bill.

General Ignatieff, at his own request, has been released from the post of Russian Minister of Interior on the ground of ill-health. He retains the membership of the Council of the Empire. Count Tolstain has been appointed Minister of the Interior.