

monthed falsehood, as base as himself, as I am quite contented to rest my character with the public. Such language however, can only proceed from a very foul, polluted heart and mind, and it is precisely what I would expect from him, and what, I think every one who reads the quotations given in my foregoing letter from his sermons, would naturally expect from him.

One of his Elders endeavoured since to justify him, by saying that my reference to the Presbyterianism might be considered by some as blackguard language, and that a gentleman might in the heat of passion use blackguard language without being a blackguard. This is as alike contemptible as it is weak, and evidence of either ignorance or something worse. Blackguard language is bad enough, but it is not blackguardism; a person might use blackguard language in the heat of passion, and might not be a "blackguard by habit and repute," as the term "blackguardism" clearly denotes and points at.

My language quoted above cannot be made blackguardism, nor yet blackguard language, it is simply severe, and truthfully descriptive of the person I had reference to, (I did not name any one,) and to prove which, the party I had reference to has been freely named by some of those who were at the meeting, shewing the correctness and truthfulness of my language, and it was only used by me, after repeated coarse attempts were made to deprive me of my just rights. I am not ashamed of any language I uttered, as I do not use language which any man need be ashamed of, and when I give an account of what passes at a meeting, I tell correctly every thing of importance.

Thirdly,—If James Walker told the truth when he said that if the trust deed had been prepared, it would have been signed before the meeting was held; then the Chairman could not have told the truth when he said that he and Mr. Ferrie would not sign the deed until they were indemnified.—I wrote Mr. Osborne a letter, pointing out to him his position, and asking him if he had any proof that he told the truth; if so, I would give him the benefit of it. He called on me last Saturday, (he having been absent for a few days,) and, in my office, again declared, *that he and Mr. Ferrie informed Mr. Walker, that they must be indemnified before that they would sign the deed, and that James Walker had not, thereafter, called upon them to ask them to do otherwise, or to offer them any indemnification.* I told him I would publish this his statement, and asked him if he was prepared to swear to the truth thereof, and he declared that he was.

This, with the eager determination of James Walker to get the resolution to indemnify passed, (he having failed with the new Trustees,) so as to get the deed signed thereafter, affords strong presumptive evidence of the falsity of James Walker's statement. At the same time it does not relieve the chairman from the sin of allowing such false statements (if his—the chairman's contrary statement—is true) to be made and repeated, *and to pass as true*, when he knew the contrary; and when I was endeavor-