

der. He then showed that whilst the idea in the address was a true one, no person pretending to deny it, and that it was better set forth in the very addresses the speaker was attempting to criticise—still the address never *once* touched the point at issue in the challenge, which was the unreasonableness, unscripturalness, and destructive character of Presbyterian views of revivals. What are these views Mr. Gaetz did not know, but he (Mr. M.) would tell him. He then gave *resume* of addresses delivered on the evening in question, appealing to those present on that occasion and this, as to the correctness of his report. He closed by describing once more the objectionable practices indulged in by so-called revivalists, which he regarded as dishonoring to God and dangerous to the souls of men, and called upon Mr. Gaetz, if such practices were indulged in and countenanced by him, to show his scriptural warrant for so doing.

Mr. Gaetz flew to his feet, and devoted another half hour, not to the repeating of fine passages, but to some purely original vulgarities and personalities, of which he showed himself to be a finished master. Take this as a specimen: "Look at the Presbyterian Church in Lunenburg town, 100 years old, and to-day there are only three persons that can pray, and one of the three has of late been so busy, that he has given up praying. Look at the Presbyterian Church over here (Cross Roads Church.) It stands 35 years, and it has to-day only six or seven persons that can pray—and these are indebted to *spurious* Methodist revivals." We need scarcely add that in this