

THE TRUE WITNESS

Subscription per annum in advance \$1.50

WEDNESDAY, OCT. 4, 1882

CATHOLIC CALENDAR OCTOBER THURSDAY, 5—Office of the Blessed Sacrament

TO SUBSCRIBERS. We have mailed to all those who are in arrears for subscriptions, etc., to THE TRUE WITNESS

"NOT GUILTY." The famous Informer case was brought to a close on last Thursday night. The jury returned a verdict of "not guilty," declaring that the defendant, Mr. John P. Whelan

THE "STAR" AND THE INFORMER CASE.

The verdict rendered by the jury in the famous Informer case, has sent the Star into the most untractable hysteria. The result has brought it no end of displeasure; in fact, we do not remember our evening

When Dillon announced, a few days ago, his intention of withdrawing from the public arena for a short time his enemies at once set the rumor afloat that his retirement was brought about by discord between himself and Parnell.

In the Church of Notre Dame on Sunday, Cure Rousselet took occasion to refer to the immoral tendency of the feuilletons or stories published in some of our contemporaries

SEE, FEEL, AND BELIEVE. "Truth conquers," and PUTNAM'S PAINLESS CORN EXTRACTOR is the embodiment of truth.

the spirit of vindictiveness makes a wonderful change come over man in general and our contemporary in particular. We are exceedingly sorry that the abolition of trial by jury should be advocated, no matter how feebly, on account of THE POST, but then we take some consolation in one of the Star's utterances, which says that trial by jury survives as a necessary evil, because no good substitute has been discovered.

THE INFORMER CASE. The evidence in rebuttal—Mr. A. P. Macdonald and James McShane, M.P.P., on the stand—The former gentleman's contradiction of Mr. Whelan's former statements—The address to the jury by Mr. C. J. Doherty. The Court of Queen's Bench this morning was again crowded with interesting listeners in the cause celebre of McNamee vs. Whelan for criminal libel.

the indictment, that he, John Patrick Whelan, contriving and unlawfully, wickedly and maliciously intending to injure, vilify and prejudice one Francis Bernard McNamee and to deprive him of his good name, fame, credit and reputation, and to bring him into public ridicule and contempt, scandal, infamy and disgrace on the 15th day of March, 1882, unlawfully, wickedly and maliciously did write and publish, and cause and procure to be written and published, a false, scandalous, malicious and defamatory libel in the form of a certain article in THE POST newspaper, printed, published and circulated in the city and district of Montreal, containing divers false, scandalous, malicious and defamatory matters, and things of and concerning the said Francis Bernard McNamee, according to the term and effect following, that is to say; and then the indictment sets out the article. Before going into what that article was, and before enquiring into whether it was or was not true, there is incumbent upon you this duty: There is more than one plea filed to this indictment.

produce, and which is printed in this same paper with the article complained of, and which Mr. McNamee swore to as being a letter of his to the defendant; and after reading that letter, would ask you gentlemen, as honest men, sworn upon oath to render a verdict according to the evidence, whether it will be possible (even if recorded by the eloquence of the eminent counsel called by the prosecutor to the support of his case, you go so far as to say that the defendant did publish this article) for you, in the face of that letter, to say that the defendant published that article maliciously and wickedly and intending to injure Mr. McNamee's good name, fame, credit and reputation, and the other eminent and distinguishing qualities of Francis B. McNamee. Gentlemen, I will read the letter. It is as follows:—

can each one of us—as each member of the public who hears this trial and reads that article undoubtedly will—come to his own conclusion concerning these motives. But I say, gentlemen, that you cannot do the defendant guilty of that with which he is charged; because even if he did the act, there is a lack of that essential element, malice—a lack of the intent to injure, vilify and defame Mr. McNamee. There was purely and simply a compliance with his request to give him that opportunity which somehow or other he found necessary of ventilating his character in a public court, and because he (McNamee) thought he required a libel to be published against him.