

become neglected! So then, after all, the people who *gladly* attend them, and who prize them so highly, are only waiting the chance of turning their backs upon them!!! Try it again Reverend Sir, and see if you can write one page without committing half-a-dozen blunders, and involving yourself in several ridiculous contradictions.

I have almost done with you for the present. If I have leisure enough, I may possibly amuse myself with your other Dialogue, meanwhile you can digest what I now offer you. Before I close, permit me to state a few reasons which I think operate to prevent attendance upon class meeting.

*First.*—I have known, and *now know* persons, who without objecting to the institution, would almost as soon meet a bear deprived of her cubs, as meet in class. Their nervous organization cannot bear the ordeal, and with the most sincere desire to avail of every helpful means of grace, they cannot profit by this.

*Second.*—Some persons are always offended (hurt) at the unlikely stories which individuals of extremely inconsistent lives are unhappily in the habit of telling at class; this has been the source of trouble and disquietude to many precious souls, if not also the cause of much skepticism and infidelity. A person of notoriously violent temper, or of doubtful veracity, or of questionable integrity in his dealings with his fellow-creatures, or of habitual inebriety—not perhaps amounting to drunkenness but half way to it—stands up and speaks of his spiritual condition as altogether encouraging; he throws in probably a few common places about temptations and trials, and concludes by thanking God for good desires, or with the stereotyped statement that he enjoys peace. This is the nomenclature of the class room, and without intending to detract from the genuine emotional piety of the truly sincere persons who use it, I affirm that in a lamentably large number of cases it is mere vague formalism. But the sticklers for naked truth stumble; they cannot understand how Mr. Twist or Mrs. Stormaway can enjoy peace, and from doubting in these cases they graduate to general skepticism—they are in the scriptural sense of the word offended, and they leave the class.

*Third.*—There are persons so constituted that they are averse to speak before others of their spiritual exercises, and yet many such feel as much, perhaps more, than those who are more talkative. You might get such individuals to speak privately to a Minister but in a class room never. Then there are some too who look upon the class as a sort of Confessional and you cannot disabuse them. Indeed the exercise sometimes assumes that appearance for the members are not always the most judicious persons in the world and many a Leader has had to interrupt narratives which were becoming rather minute.

Objections like these, and many others that might be enumerated, are entertained to meeting in class, and yet the objectors may all be persons of piety or well disposed to seek religion. If class meeting were regarded like any other means of grace, and the duty of attendance enforced by the grave considerations which may safely be used in its favour, it would retain its value irrespective of the rule. Seasons of social prayer, hearing God's word preached, the Lord's Supper and other similar privileges are not guarded by coercive enactments, but are they therefore more neglected than class meetings? I reply with an emphatic NO, and all your special pleading to the contrary notwithstanding, I hold with an increasing many, that the rule which demands unconditional submission, is tyrannical and therefore unchristian.

In conclusion, you and I and everybody in the Methodist Church know, that this *stringent* law is *habitually slighted*, and that the discipline is not enforced. You know that thousands of nominal members are kept on the books who are seldom if ever found in attendance upon class, and more, you know that there is very little disposition on the part of the Ministers generally to expel such delinquents, but that any trifling excuse is taken in explanation, if explanation is demanded. The rule in effect is, as it ought to be, A NULLITY.

I am, Reverend Sir,

Yours truly,

SCRUTATOR.

P.S.—This letter should be read with the Pamphlet at hand for reference.

The writer does not at all pretend to be a scholar, and he is well persuaded that a good grammarian may find much to criticize in his own performance; yet, appreciating the importance of educational competency in a Wesleyan Minister who undertakes to write for the public, his jealousy for the honor of the church has prompted him to enter his protest against the literary labors of the Reverend Mr. Borland. Previous to the publication of the letter a proof copy was furnished to that gentleman, and he was invited to point out any misrepresentations it might contain, but he did not reply.