

to be discontinued. Why not? Political meetings, when tending to disturb the public peace and subvert the government, have been put down in every civilized country in the world. And I am credibly informed, that a religious society, not a hundred miles from the Falls of Niagara, have been lately notified by the Police, that unless their meetings were conducted in a more orderly manner, they would be compelled by law to discontinue them. I have known persons taken before a magistrate for preaching in the streets, because by collecting crowds of people in the public thoroughfares, business was obstructed, and foot-passengers subjected to great annoyance.

I give your next paragraph entire. It is the richest specimen of unintelligible composition I have met with for a long time. It is more difficult to understand than the utterances of the ancient oracles. It may have half a dozen different meanings, but which is the one you intended to put before your readers, I confess, I am unable to say. You ought, Mr. D., to have supplied a key to your meaning:

"But, while our Saviour has set us an example by teaching the people on the Sabbath day, though opposers as well as adherents attended, and even raised actual disputes with himself, thus certainly making the meeting which he himself conducted, the occasion of their aggravating sin, we feel justified in doing likewise, especially while supported by the practice of the evangelical churches in general, and of the Baptist churches in particular, in their devout attendance on what they esteem public Christian baptism by immersion, in the midst of the giddy throng, even though the reviling crowd profanely insult God and religion by soiling the crystal stream, to the annoyance of the worshippers; or daringly profane the ordinance by the immersion of dogs, in mock imitation of what they call bapsousing, ducking, &c., just in the same spirit in which a 'CHRISTIAN SPECTATOR' seems to have observed religious simplicity in the prayer meetings. If we are 'responsible to God and the community' for the evil results of the camp-meeting, to whom shall those referred to render their account? When we are condemned, how will they escape? Except they repent shall they not likewise perish?"

If there be any argument in the above in favor of Camp-meetings, be kind enough to put it into intelligible English, and I will reply to it.

Your next paragraph I also give entire, for the same reason. It is nearly as dark and involved as the other:

"Oh what a pity that his scathing, withering rebuke against Sabbath desecration, and youthful demoralization, could not have fallen on the ears of the inspired Paul and Barnabas when nearly the whole city came together to hear the word of God: perhaps they would not then have grown bold in their dispute with the Jewish Doctors and others who like a 'SPECTATOR' were filled with envy when they saw the multitudes, feeling no doubt as 'some have done lately, the loss of their stereotype congregations in the renowned city.'"

You seem to think, however, that "some" have "lately" been "feeling" "keenly" "the loss of their 'stereotype congregations.'"

I have heard, Mr. D., of small congregations and large congregations, rich congregations and poor congregations, black congregations and white congregations, &c., but this is the first time I have "made the acquaintance" of a "stereotype" congregation. What precise information you wished to communicate to your readers by the above sentence I really don't know. If you wished to say that some ministers in Welland or in the neighborhood, had lately lost their congregations, and were feeling keenly their loss, in the name of common sense why didn't you say so? You always seem to wish to say something, but are never able to say it. Your ideas struggle to come to the birth, but are never born.

As I have not heard that any minister in this place has lost his congregation, I conclude that the loss, at which you hint, has no existence but in your own disordered imagination. The wish is father to the thought! When you next sit down, Mr. D., to write a letter that is intended for the public eye, please have a dictionary at your elbow; the frequent use of it may prevent you from writing so much "stereotype" nonsense.

You inform your readers that it is your intention, and the intention of your brethren, in future to do "as they," viz: Paul and Barnabas "did." I am very glad to know this; because if you follow the example, which these eminently pious and devoted servants of Christ exhibited, while they lived on earth, there will be no occasion for Spectator or anybody else calling you to account for encouraging Sabbath desecration, noise, tumult and fanaticism at your religious meetings.

Before, however, you finish your sentence, you charge "a Christian," i.e. "Spectator," with denouncing the very "principle" which "he practices every Sabbath day;" "namely, convening all that can be got together for public worship." Pray, Mr. D., be good enough to point out the sentence or paragraph in my letters in which I denounce this "principle." You certainly manifest in a very striking way "the unpretending simplicity of a babe," when you