

the excitement at the camp is highest—the attention of the managers is then most confined to the exclusive scenes of the meeting—and the best opportunities are then afforded by the surrounding darkness for the ‘workers of iniquity to hide themselves;’ that hundreds flock to such places for mirth and recreation, and many for much worse purposes; that independently of the indecent postures (spoken of by Wesley and others), and besides the malign influence of protracted intercourse, the accommodations for lodging at night are such as will commend themselves to no modest person, particularly to no modest female, as can easily be shown by a reference to facts. These and many other things plainly show that these meetings are not sanctioned by good sense or sound morality, much less by that religion which forbids the very ‘appearance of evil.’

“And when we add the awful profanation of the holy Sabbath, occasioned by the rush of hundreds from every quarter, as to the festal scenes of a holiday, or to the merriment and dissipation of some great fair, well may the serious Christian pause and ask, ‘Can these things be duty in a land like this, where every neighborhood has or may soon have a convenient place of worship, at which, by traveling a short distance, all may receive instruction in the mysteries of redeeming love?’ Surely it cannot be a work of necessity in any sense, to mingle with the worship of the Lord of glory, anything which bears so strong a resemblance to the works of darkness. If indeed the system were so amended, that camp-meetings should never extend to the Sabbath, many of the above objections would be removed.”

But why, sir, do you shrink from investigation? The spirit and prayer of a true Christian is: “Search me, O God, and know my heart; try me and know my thoughts, and see if there be any wicked way in me;” but you meet me with the words of the wicked Ahab—“Hast thou found me out, O mine enemy!” Honest men never dread the closest scrutiny. It is only those who are conscious of evil doing that hate the light.

“We really cannot account,” you say, “for the concurrent and horrible exaggeration in respect to the disorder in the congregation,” &c.

You find it much easier, Mr. D., to assert than to prove. Will you be kind enough, next time you take your pen in hand, to state one or two instances in which I have either told untruths or exaggerated? I beg to assure you that many of your readers are not prepared to accept of your naked assertion, in preference to the evidence offered by their own senses. When you ask those who attended your camp-meeting to believe your simple *ipse dixit*, rather than their own eyes and ears, you ask a little too much; and you need not be surprised if they obstinately refuse to do any such thing. A great many of those who have read your letter, are astonished at your audacity in attempting to controvert what hundreds know to be facts.

Again you say, “We cannot account, from any other feeling on their part, than either that of corrupt envy, illustrated in vile insinuation, or deep conviction for sin, restrained only by persistent impenitence.” This is a sad jumble, Mr. D. It would puzzle a score of Philadelphia lawyers to know what this wordy sentence means. “Corrupt envy”—I thought that “envy” was in its very nature corrupt, and did not require the use of an adjective to describe its qualities. How envy can be “illustrated in deep conviction for sin restrained,” &c., I really don’t know. Not long since, a person who had “tried his hand” at preaching, remarked to a friend that he had plenty of words, but “he was awfully bothered for ideas.” This, Mr. D., is emphatically your “bother.”

You add—“The general order in the congregations in time of service was good, and the attention devout, both on Sabbath and on week day, except on the part of a few who seemed to be ‘SPECTATORS.’”

It is unnecessary for me to make any remark on this “other assertion,” as your very voluminous epistle professes to be a defence of “shouting,” “whistling,” “leaping,” “babbling,” “confusion” and “disorder” in religious meetings.

You proceed to remark that “Camp-meetings, both with us and each of the Methodist bodies in Canada, are endorsed and attended by those in the highest rank, both lay and clerical, and they have increased 20 per cent. in numbers in thirty years. To these facts we challenge official contradiction.”

Does each of the Methodist bodies in Canada endorse the scenes that hundreds witnessed at your late Camp-meeting? Hear the Editor of the “*Christian Guardian*” (Wesleyan):

“Methodism does NOT SANCTION NOR ENCOURAGE EXTRAVAGANCE OF ANY KIND; it is the uncompromising foe of fanaticism; it CONDEMNES every thing VISIONARY and UNSCRIPTURAL; it exalts the PRACTICAL and USEFUL above the MERELY SPECULATIVE and EMOTIONAL; it LOVES ORDER and EDIFICATION in all religious services; and it soon cures IRRATIONAL EXCESSES in the few by the influence and example of the many, and by the instruction and rules of its worship.”

The Editor of the *Guardian*, who wrote in entire ignorance of the facts of the case, but