

who doubtless by this time has been better informed. unceremoniously dismisses 'Spectator's' letter as 'unworthy of belief'; but adds—"We think it quite sufficient to say that if there ever was such a meeting it is worthy of the severest condemnation!" (!!!)

Probably, however, without even giving the 'Guardian' a smile of recognition, you will beckon him away to the shades, to keep company with Dr. Adam Clarke, the 'doubting Thomas' of Camp-meetings.

You assert that Camp-meetings have increased 20 per cent. 'during the last thirty years.' I will believe it, Mr. D., when you produce 'official' proof. You seem to be totally ignorant of the rules of argumentation. "If I assert a doctrine I must prove it; for until it is proved it can have no claim to reception. If I obstinately refuse proof, I leave my doctrine without foundation, and a simple denial of it is sufficient. No man can be called on to disprove that which alleges no proof. What is *disproof* but the refutation of *proof*? And what has no proof needs no refutation." Mark, learn and inwardly digest this valuable rule, Mr. D.; attention to it in any future defence of Camp-meetings, may be of great service to you.

"We are informed," you say, "that the man who put his head into the woman's lap was that woman's husband." The statement I make in my letter is as follows: "One person, apparently overpowered with sleep, put his head in the lap of a woman to whom he was an *entire stranger*." I beg to inform you, Mr. D., that the wife of the person to whom I allude, did not attend the Camp-meeting at all! Moreover, when two of your direct ren-co-workers with you at the Camp-meeting—called at my house, I gave them the name and address of the individual to whom I refer. And more, Mr. D., one of these brethren is well acquainted with the person in question, and might—for he lives at no great distance from him—have at any time verified my statement.

You have undesignedly revealed a fact which proves that the laying of male heads in female laps was rather general at the Camp-meeting. I am glad, that, though mistaken as to the individual, you admit the fact.

But you further assert, "that one of the men who led away the so-called young woman, was her proper guardian for the time, &c., and challenge proof to the contrary, or silence in the future."

The statement I made in my letter, on this matter, is as follows: "The two young men referred to seemed anxious to get her away" (the person in dispute); told her "they knew a nice place where she could go. After a little parleying, during which each seemed anxious to have the sole charge of her; the three walked out of the tent. The girl evidently did not know the persons who thus officiously thrust their questionable services upon her."

Does Mr. D., contradict this statement? Not a word of it. He merely tells his readers that one of these young men was "her proper guardian for the time." Yet you challenge proof. Proof for what, Mr. D.?

I stated in one of my letters that a reliable friend of mine who spent an entire night on the camp-ground, had reported this fact to me; and to the 'brother' who came to my house with a Justice of the Peace to get me to affirm under oath the truth of my statements respecting your meeting, I gave the name of the individual, with whom he is well acquainted, and whose truthfulness he knows to be unquestionable. Moreover, to prove to him that I was perfectly justified in using the phrase 'questionable attentions' in relating the affair, I gave him a piece of information, which I have withheld from the public. Did this 'brother' go to this individual to ascertain whether the matter as stated by 'Spectator,' was correct? No, sir; on learning his name, he concluded not to pursue his investigations further in that direction. I have reason to believe, Mr. D., that you know all about this affair. Your friend, Mr. S., who called upon me, doubtless told you all that passed between him and me on the subject. The above statement is merely intended to hoodwink the public.

The next paragraph is both significant and threatening!

"We have no wish to encourage sin, not even in a 'Christian;' lewdness and libels should both be brought to legal justice, yet we hope the persons anonymously scandalized in the strictures will forbear legal prosecution, at least for the present."

Your meaning will be more apparent to your readers if I translate the above thus: "We have no wish to encourage sin, not even in a 'Christian.' Persons guilty of lewdness and defamation of character ought to be brought to justice. An anonymous writer in the 'People's Press,' has defamed certain parties who attended our Camp-meeting; for which he ought to be prosecuted." As I am, however, a christian man, and do not desire to return evil for evil, I would kindly advise the parties whom he has slandered not to proceed against him, at least for the present. Perhaps he may retract, apologise, or be silent in future."

This is really what you wanted to say, Mr. D. Well, sir, here is my answer to your covert threat:—I am ready, whenever called upon, to go into any Court of Justice in Canada, to prove, before a competent Judge and Jury, the truth of ALL that I have said in letters respecting the Camp-meeting, lately held in Yokon's bush; and, if necessary, with TWO HUNDRED