

Mr. Mitchell and elementary language to state that mere minutes or records may not be correct or correctly kept, and such statements do not imply or insinuate malice, but that the party keeping such records has kept them incorrectly. In any case even supposing Plaintiff had made the charge before Defendant's statement, which is improbable, and disproved by the mass of evidence in the record, would seem that it was not without considerable truth and that in point of fact the circumstances justified the making of such charge.

more valuable witnesses speaking. The charge of Defendant on the other hand, was ten months after a most serious nature, deeply affecting the standing of the Plaintiff and which owing to the unwillingness of those who should have acted a better part went uncontradicted to a meeting exasperated against him. The very words of the accusation show a premeditation on part of Defendant, and that the charge was orderly. "I am sorry that some of the Congregation did not witness the scene that the Session had witnessed yesterday, when the minister was called a liar, after our most solemn services. Mr. Johnston called his minister a liar."

Plaintiffs witness. The Defendant uses the word "liar" twice in his accusation. His sentences are finished and complete. If he meant as he says he did to charge the Plaintiff with calling the minister a liar "in effect," why did he not supplement the *first* word "liar" as he desired. The true intention is shown by the repetition of the word "liar." The alleged offence is magnified by adding the words "after our most solemn service" meaning the Communion Service the chief sacrament of the Presbyterian Church. The resolution too passed by the meeting "That in view of the fact that Mr.