

In another part of your letter you say that I have "spoken and written sentiments of hostility toward Dr. Irvine, even dating these feelings back to your first coming to this City—your statement in Presbytery, on the 9th April, and there reported, being, "when I came to Hamilton, I determined to be respectful, but not to be on any intimate terms with Dr. Irvine." I have oftener than once had occasion to defend myself and others from hostile attacks made by Dr. Irvine; but I have never spoken or written sentiments of hostility towards him. The proof which you bring forward is a supremely ridiculous one. The report of my speech, as quoted by you, is correct, though imperfect: that is, it is a single sentence of my speech without the other remarks made in connection with it. But taking it as it stands, surely the avowal of a determination to be respectful but not intimate with a man is very far removed from an expression of hostile feelings. What I said to you, in our conversation, might have satisfied you on this point; but since you again force this subject upon my attention, I must add that, while I have often expressed my opinions of Dr. Irvine's conduct, in his presence in Presbytery, and have no wish to conceal them now, my sentiments towards him, even now, are those of sincere pity, but not of hostility in any proper sense of that word.

In the closing paragraph of your letter you say, "I accepted your statement as to your non-interference in the arrangements for supplying our City pulpits by Mr. Guinness from the 6th to 10th May, alleging that you introduced him to Dr. Ormiston and to no other Minister—that other Ministers called upon him and made their own appointments. I learn on good authority that this is not in accordance with fact, as you did write a note on Saturday, 4th of May, proposing for Mr. Guinness, to a Minister of this City, to preach on the following Wednesday evening, the time of the weekly service in Knox's Church."

Gently—Mr. Walker—gently; you are treading on slippery ground again. The first part of this paragraph contains a good deal more of impression upon your own mind than of anything said by me. First of all, I never used the word non-interference, nor any words equivalent to it. Non-interference means that I did not in any way advise with Mr. Guinness; but you could not understand me as saying this, for you heard me advise Mr. Guinness to preach in Knox's Church,* and you alluded to that fact in the conversation in question.

Then, you make a mere explanatory statement in reference to Dr. Ormiston, and that not very correctly reported—the main part of what I said to you. What I did say was, that I was not in any way responsible for Mr. G's appointment—that he had made them with the Ministers themselves, and that Dr. Ormiston was the only one of the Ministers who had called for him whom I had notified of his arrival—that the others had called of their own accord.

The above is strictly in accordance with fact. Beyond my opening my own pulpit to him, I had no responsibility in the matter. I left Mr. G., as my guest, free to take his own course. As to writing to a Minister

* This will forcibly remind those who have heard it, of the story of the Rev. Fellow of Trinity College Dublin, who, during an election time, seeing a particular political character crossing the court-yard of the college, called out to a number of students:—"I say, boys, don't nail his ear to the pump—ah! don't." The pump being in the middle of the yard, it is needless to inform our readers of the immediate attention given to the sage advice of the rev. gentleman.