

Layman's letter in the STANDARD of the 11th of May they will find these words: "In conclusion I may state that I have no intention of continuing this discussion at present. My time is too much occupied with other matters." Which of his statements shall we believe?

It then "struck" Layman "as not very complimentary to Mr. L. for 'Presbyter' to step in and take up a matter already begun by a 'Methodist minister.'" He then adds: "However, I fancy the matter was all pre-arranged, and if the Methodists of this county are satisfied with their defenders, I have no cause to complain."

Now perhaps it may give ease to his troubled mind when I inform Layman that his "fancy" has led him altogether astray. It was not pre-arranged. Neither Presbyter nor any one else outside my own family knew anything about my letters till they were in the hands of the printer; nor did Presbyter see either of them till he saw them in print, nor anyone else for that matter, except the printers themselves. And just here I may also correct the false statement made by a clerical member of the firm of Churchman, Layman & Co. to the effect that "Mr. Lawson was assisted by Presbyter in preparing his second letter." Neither Presbyter nor anyone else but myself had any thing to do with its preparation. I am solely responsible for every line, and might, with equal propriety have subscribed myself, as Layman did to the preface to his pamphlet,—*"THE AUTHOR!"* By the way, although Layman in his preface says they were "averse to any clerical hand appearing" yet it *appears* he is not "averse" now to "clerical" help, (and perhaps was not before, so long as it did not *"appear"*), and consequently judges me by himself.

I appreciate the compliment, however, which was thus, though unwit-

tingly, paid both to Presbyter and myself. As was remarked by a person of more than ordinary intelligence and education, it showed that they felt the force of the arguments and facts there stated, and therefore concluded they must have been the product of no ordinary writer, and so gave the credit, in part at least, to Presbyter, whose articles recently published in the STANDARD, prove him to be a man of keen intelligence, extensive information and high literary attainments.

But why was it "not very complimentary" for Presbyter to write those four letters? I am sure there was nothing uncomplimentary so far as I was concerned, as I stated in my first letter that I did not "wish to go into anything like a full review of the pamphlet," intending to write simply that one letter, also adding, "unless it be really necessary and time can be found." Perhaps I should thank Layman for his kind solicitude on my behalf, but I beg to assure him I do not need it, and he had better keep all his sympathy for himself, as the articles in question are far more "complimentary" to me than to him. "Aye, there's the rub." And as a matter of fact I may state, that so far from there being any "pre-arrangement" between us, some of Presbyter's letters were written before my second letter, though I was not then aware of the fact, and one of them actually in the hands of the editor, who thought best, however, on receiving mine, to give it the precedence. Hence Layman's "fancy," like many of his alleged facts, is not to be trusted. As to the "Methodists being satisfied" I may say that complimentary allusion to my letters by the accomplished editor-in-chief of the *Christian Guardian*, Rev. Dr. Dewart, some weeks ago, the fact that the Methodists have published my last letter in tract form for free distribution, and that they intend hav-