

felt if I had taken the same liberty with his name that he did with the names of the holy founders of our church, calling them Paul, Peter and John, as if they were not entitled to the ordinary courtesy of civilization. True, after three days hard study, he said he found them so named in the Bible. Grant it; but does that authorize him profanely to grate on the ears of a Christian people by using such familiarity with the names of the holy Apostles of our Lord. Suppose I heard the gentleman's brother call him Johnny, and his sister by the name of Mary, what would he think of me in presuming the same familiarity? and if on greeting him I said, accordingly to the example of his brother, "Well, Johnny, how are you, and how is Mary?" would he not have reason to complain. And does Mr. Torrance require to be treated with more respect than they, who, under God, gave us our ministry and sacraments. If according to my very best knowledge I cannot recognize him as Lord High Admiral of Her Majesty's fleet, am I obliged, because I live in free and happy Canada, on pain of being knocked down in the street to acknowledge the title: and if I regard Mr. Torrance as a very eloquent layman, and know him to be such, am I to have both my eyes blackened because I do not know the very contrary to be true. As well might he endeavor to force me to believe that to reject infants

from baptism was no Christian immorality, and that it was not fraught with fearfully irreligious consequences, commencing by making other people pay for feigned expression of regard for God, D. V., with Mathew, John, Peter and Mark, and finally to profane the sacred name by which we are called. The fact was I said nothing at all about his ministry, and the inference he drew from my letter was exclusively his own. I might honestly reject the gentleman's ministry, not on episcopal ground merely, but on Presbyterian also, and am I to blame for knowledge against which I cannot shut my eyes: this however, I have nothing to do with at present. If the gentleman can satisfy himself that he is anything more than a layman, that is his own business, and I have nothing to do with it. He objects to plain Mr. Torrance but the gentleman did not even honor our first bishop by plain Mr. Paul, Mr. Peter, or Mr. John; simply because they were not of his religion, and no fault can be found with them on that account for it was not heard of on the face of the whole earth; nor in heaven in their day; nor for hundreds of years afterwards.

I again repeat my assertion that I did not, under any circumstance, refuse to meet Mr. Torrance in debate. He frequently said that he would keep me to the wording of the subject of my lecture unconnected