

suppose that your *mere assertion* ought to outweigh all evidence to the contrary. Your conceit and presumption are only equalled by your ignorance.

Your next paragraph is so amusing, and withal so "like the man" that wrote it, that I cannot forbear giving it word for word. Here it is:

"We wonder if he would not be almost tempted to spiritual pride on account of his own popularity, if he could command such an audience as he saw the other day: even should he be lame, and incapacitated for physical religious demonstrations except in the desk or the baptistry, methinks there at least he would leap like *an hart*."

How I should feel if I could every Sabbath day "command such an audience as I saw the other day" at your Camp-meeting. I really can't say. As I have not yet arrived at "perfection," and feel daily sensible that I am the subject of human infirmities, I *might* feel some risings of "spiritual pride," on seeing some five thousand expectant listeners before me. I hardly think, however, that, even under these circumstances, I should leap like "an hart." As you very delicately remark, my lameness "incapacitates me for physical religious demonstrations;" while the fear of being considered a lunatic would doubtless restrain me from playing the fool in the presence of so many spectators.

A discerning public, Mr. D., will, without doubt, fully appreciate the weight of argument which this paragraph contains in favor of your Camp-meeting, while they will not fail to see, in every sentence you have written, traces of that Christian politeness and refinement, which your favorite institution seems to have imparted to your heart and mind.

You say; "The mercantile transactions in eatables, &c., on the Sabbath, so far as countenanced by the Church, I avowedly denounce, and ardently hope to see them at once and forever discontinued."

Will you oblige your readers, Mr. D., by informing them, when you began to denounce the sale of tobacco, edibles, &c., by your society on the Lord's day? Was it when the arrangements were being made by your brethren to erect a refreshment stand on the Camp-ground? or during the progress of the meeting? or *after my letters appeared in the Welland Press*? Answer, Mr. D. Had you anything to do in the making of these arrangements? Did your society discipline those "brethren and sisters" who were guilty, under the most aggravating circumstances, of desecrating the Sabbath? Have these brethren and sisters been brought to repentance? When did you deal with the erring ones? You tell your readers that it was wrong to sell edibles, &c., on the Sabbath day. Well, have you followed the rule laid down in your book of Discipline, page 60, where the preacher is enjoined "to tell every one under his care what he thinks wrong in his conduct and temper: and that lovingly and plainly, as soon as may be." Ah! Mr. D., you make a virtue of necessity. But for my letters, the public would never have heard of your "avowed denouncement" of this species of Sabbath-breaking by your society. You would have been as silent as the grave on the subject. Sabbath desecration is evidently regarded by you "a very trifling sin, when compared with the enormous wickedness of uttering a word against camp-meetings. I would ask you and your brethren to read attentively, Nehemiah xiii: 15-18. I quote a portion of it:—"And I testified against them in the day wherein they sold victuals. There dwelt men of Tyre also which brought fish and all manner of ware and sold on the Sabbath unto the children of Judah, and in Jerusalem. Then I contended with the nobles of Judah, and said unto them, What evil thing is this ye do and profane the Sabbath day? Did not your fathers thus and did not our God bring all this evil upon us and upon our city? yet ye bring more wrath upon Israel by profaning the Sabbath."

While meditating on the above, your impressions might be deepened, if you would turn to the 71st page of your Book of Discipline, and leisurely read the following, which I quote verbatim for the benefit of those who may not happen to have a copy:—"The world says, 'The Methodists are no better than other people.' This is not true in the general; But 1. personal religion either toward God or man is too *SUPERFICIAL* among us. * * * How little faith is there among us! How little communion with God! How little living in heaven, walking in eternity, deadness to every creature! How much love of the world! desire of applause, of ease, of getting money! How little brotherly love! What continual judging one another! What gossiping, evil-speaking, tale-bearing! WHAT WANT OF MORAL HONESTY! to instance only in one particular: Who does as he would be done by in buying and selling? Family religion is wanting in many branches. * * * We must, yea every travelling preacher must INSTRUCT the people from house to house. Till this be done, and that in good earnest, Methodists will be no better. Our religion is not sufficiently deep, universal, uniform, but *SUPERFICIAL, partial and uneven.*"

I hope, Mr. D., you will not accuse me of garbling. I have given you almost the entire paragraph, which I have carefully copied from the Book of Discipline of the "Methodist