

Q. I just wanted to get it clear that it was not quite the same as you are putting it. The way you are presenting it they could be put in jail for studying a chapter in Thessalonian. A. I should like to say --

Q. I should not like to leave it quite like that.

A. I will put it this way, --

Q. The prosecution might be terrible but I do not think it is quite as bad as -- A. Let me put it this way. The answer from the point of view of the Crown is: we do not care what went on at that meeting. These people were Jehovah's witnesses, therefore a conviction follows. Now the answer from their point of view is this, what was the dominating purpose for them coming together; it was to study first Thessalonian, the 5th Chapter, to learn what God's word had for them. The primary --

Q. I do not think that is the gravamen of the charge in any such case. If you examined this thing I think you would find, in my opinion, that would not be the gravamen of the charge in any case. The purpose of these people was to get together to study such and such a chapter of Thessalonian. Now, that point is No.1 against them. I feel quite sure you are wrong. As to the lawyer's procedure on the case that would not be the gravamen of the charge. A. No, but here is a point. Surely, if the Crown is going to put these people --

Q. You say the Crown; I am just talking about the procedure in a case where a lawyer sets out his case where he has one, two, three or four points to deal with. He first of all writes down point No.1, Rex v. Powley, and he says, "What is the evidence in support of point No.1?" That is the way a lawyer thinks. The first point that he writes down on his brief is: these people have gathered together to study first Thessalonian. Now, if I prove that I have gone step No.1 in