

on Monday evening; and now it appears that your real reason for not preaching in Knox's Church is, not what you stated to Mr. Walker, nor "several reasons" as stated in your note of yesterday, but what you stated to the Rev. Thomas Pullar, viz., that you had been told on "good authority of *certain christian persons in town*, that Dr. Irvine is not a Christian."

The fine-drawn distinction which you make in the first page of your letter of this morning, can be only regarded as a contemptible subterfuge, unworthy alike of a gentleman and a Christian.

Surely we had good cause to be warned by an article in page 109 of our *Presbyterian Ecclesiastical and Missionary Record* for this month, on "THE PLYMOUTH BRETHREN," published at Toronto.

It appears from Mr. Walker's statement, that on the 4th inst., you heard of me for the first time in your life. On the 5th you heard of me from the Rev. Mr. Ormiston; on the 6th you once more heard of me from the same two gentlemen. On the 8th inst., I met you in company with the Rev. Mr. Pullar—all of whom, I learn, urged you to occupy my pulpit. Now, if any "christian persons in town" led you to believe that the above-named brethren had attempted to entrap you into the pulpit of one who "is not a Christian," surely you might, at once, have furnished the names of these christian persons to Dr. Ormiston, Mr. Pullar and Deacon Walker, and challenged *their* conduct, in attempting such an act of deception upon a "stranger in the place, in these painful circumstances."

Besides, in yours of the 13th inst., you say that the Rev. David Inglis, whose guest you are, "*pressed you to consent to preach for me.*"

Now, if you are likely to be guided by the wish of any one, it would most assuredly be by that of your host, to whom you should also have communicated the information of these "Christian persons in town;" and had you done so, I am sure he would not for a moment have pressed you, "a stranger in the place, in these painful circumstances," to occupy the pulpit of one who was declared, on such testimony, to be "not a Christian."

But you accept the testimony, it seems, of certain "Christian persons in town," and on it "*take up an evil report,*" while you had also the testimony of other "Christian persons," such as that of the Rev. Dr. Ormiston, the Rev. Mr. Pullar, and Deacon Walker—not to speak of the practical testimony of the Rev. gentleman whose guest you are, in "*pressing you to preach for me.*" And on the testimony of these Christian persons, you not only disregard the expressed wishes of Clergymen and Office Bearers of the Churches here, but actually set at nought the "*pressing request*" of the gentleman whose hospitality you are enjoying.

I have now again to demand the "good authority" mentioned in your letter, and have instructed my messenger to wait for the names and residences of these "Christian persons in town," which, as a Christian gentleman, you are bound at once to furnish.

Again wishing your mission to Canada greater success elsewhere, and praying that you may be under the guidance of *wiser* Christian persons in future.

I am, Sir,

Your very obedient servant,

R. IRVINE.

In reference to the foregoing, the following was received from the Rev. Thomas Pullar:—

HUGHSON STREET, May 14, 1861.

REV. DR. IRVINE:—

MY DEAR SIR,—Having seen Mr. Guinness' reply to yours of yesterday, enclosing a copy of my note to you, I feel it to be my duty to you, to truth, and to all concerned, to pronounce it *a most unworthy and pitiful evasion*. It makes *bad worse*. What on earth is the difference between his saying "you are not a Christian, and saying that "he has been informed, on good authority, that you are not a Christian," when he was avowing *his belief of it*, and giving it as his reason for not preaching in your church? It