

dence for me to reply to? Any one of ordinary understanding reading my letter of the 22nd April, from which a single sentence is quoted in Dr. Irvine's letter to Messrs. Stark, Smellie, & Co., &c., must see at once that my statement was a denial of a statement made by Dr. Irvine in a previous communication to the *Spectator* (but which was not made on the floor of the Presbytery), to the effect that I had characterized Mr. McIndoe's letters as vile, and that, so far as the recommendation to commit the letter to the flames is concerned, it could not be held by Dr. Irvine as implying that I regarded Mr. McIndoe's letters as vile, as Dr. Irvine's own letters were included with Mr. McIndoe's in the recommendation.\* Had the correspondence been to the effect that Dr. Irvine's statement was true, and that I had characterized Mr. McIndoe's letters as vile—then it had been well to publish it in the public papers in order to get justice for your Minister, and I might have felt it necessary to reply—but as the correspondence stands it needs no answer from me.†

\* Within one week from this date the Rev. David Inglis planned and carried out a burning business in another case.

A Minister who had spoken improperly in Presbytery on the 10th of April last, subsequently withdrew the statement, but on a letter being addressed to him, detailing the facts of the case, and asking a reply, saying if all the statements were as he considered they were made, he replied in a most insulting letter. A memorial to the Presbytery was forthwith drawn and transmitted, and at Galt, on the 17th, (a week after) it was heard. Mr. Inglis acted as clerk, (Mr. Middlemiss having left) and he was forced to admit he had been an adviser in the case. The memorialist was asked what he required, and his desire was at once acceded to, namely, that the Minister should withdraw his expression in Presbytery, and his letter, and that it should be recorded in the Minutes. This was considered most reasonable, but the Rev. David Inglis proposed the burning process, as before. To this the memorialist objected, but said he would consent to the Presbytery doing as they pleased if it were admitted *his* letter was "unexceptionable." This was responded to by a burst of "Certainly;" but mark the result. The Presbytery met next at Montreal, and there, in the absence of the memorialist, the Rev. David Inglis resisted the introduction of this statement into the finding, and in the hurry of dissolution of the Presbytery, never to meet again, he succeeded in perpetrating his design, and some day soon we may hear that because these letters are recorded as burned, it was because they were *both* vile. The clerk, however, has been notified, for the information of "all whom it may concern," that they will not be burned. It is only justice to the christian character of the Minister in question to say, that he asked for an interview with Dr. Irvine, and made an apology for what he had said of him in the letter—and this unasked or unrequested—and, it is believed, deeply regrets the advice he took.

† Mr. Inglis speaks truly here. Dr. Irvine used the word "considered," not "characterised." The latter is counterfeit; Mr. Inglis coined it. Mr. Inglis dared not have quoted the passage correctly. Dr. Irvine, in Presbytery, on the 10th April, in replying to the Rev. Duncan McRuar's personal attack, (as can be verified) said:—"I may allude to the part acted by Mr. Inglis in the case. It "will be remembered," &c., &c.; "and he '*considered*' these letters so vile that "they ought not to pollute the records of the Court by being allowed to remain "among them, and it was at his recommendation, as Moderator, that the Clerk of "the Court was directed to commit them to the flames, yet the rev. gentleman, on "the Sabbath but one following, took the author of these letters and placed him "in the pulpit of McNab Street Church to minister to his congregation."

Mr. Inglis states what is false if he asserts that these identical words were not spoken by Dr. Irvine, in Presbytery, on the occasion in question; and he never dared, though present, to utter one word in reply to them. He was silent—and then, when none of the five Members of Committee were present, he raises a false issue—substitutes the word "characterised" for "considered," and has met the castigation he deserved in the letters from the Rev. Messrs. Smellie, Cheyne, Stark, Hodgkin, and Middlemiss.