

[The following on the same subject has come to hand, without any communication for us.—EDITOR.]

DEAR SIR,—I see by a note in the November number of the *Canadian Presbyterian* that the appearance of my letter in your magazine for October is regretted as “indicating a change of feeling or of policy” on your part. Of course you are well able to answer for yourself. But if it be thus hinted that you are becoming hostile to union, because there were indications of hostility to such an union in the communication in question, I not only disclaim any such feelings of hostility, but must express my surprise that any one should have been able to discover in it the slightest trace of any thing of the kind.

As you and any ordinary intelligent reader would at once understand, the whole drift of the letter was to show that on certain points there is a necessity for forbearance if there is to be union, inasmuch as there is a considerable diversity of sentiment, and that this would be the less difficult, because in the Free Church already there is forbearance, as far as ordinary members are concerned, not only in reference to the points specially at issue, but in reference to others of even greater importance.

It is very kind, but very *innocent* in the *Presbyter* to hint that a little “more experience” will enable me to answer my own questions without any assistance, when the very object in putting those questions is to show still more, that if one side needs *forbearance* on certain points, not less necessitous is the other.

They are questions of *fact*, let me hint to our friend, not of Church order or principles.

As to the hint about “arrogance” on the part of not a few of our Free Church friends, I have merely to say that far from the feelings which suggested it being “imported,” they are those of almost every minister in our Church with whom I have conversed on the subject. Even members of the Union Committee have mentioned to me that so strongly have they felt on this point, that but for their anxious desire for union, they would have entered a pointed and public protest against not a little of the thing referred to.

Personally I have no feeling of “soreness.” Neither in this country nor in Scotland have I suffered even once from the “patronage” or “condescension” of any Free Church minister.

Their somewhat grandiose airs have occasionally amused me, and the manner in which some of them have urged their claims to be regarded as the genuine successors and representatives of the “hill men,” has sometimes had a dash of the ludicrous about it to such an extent as to be somewhat *trying*. But I have comforted myself with the hope that an “enlarged experience” would modify all this very considerably.

Would you allow me to add that it is with very great pleasure indeed I observe the spirit in which the article on union in the *Presbyter* is written. Whatever the writer may think of my “spirit” (and I am sure it was, and is, far from unfriendly to union), I cannot say of his that it is “none of the best.”

W. I.

SKETCHES FROM THE LIFE OF THE REV. WILLIAM JENKINS, RICHMOND HILL.

The mental labours of a missionary must be very arduous, and to some extent irksome, before he has mastered the language of the people among whom he labours. This dreary toil must be greatly increased, when there are in their language very few affinities to the languages of civilized and Christianised nations. Think of the uncouth words, composed of many consonants, and but few vowels, of the many syllables required to express a very simple object or idea; over these he pores from day to day, or hears them pronounced