

action happening in Montreal in the year 1852, can affect the statement of some plain facts at Islington in the year 1862, is what I cannot comprehend, and it was merely by way of a solution of this logical inconsistency, and not as tendering advice to any one, that I ventured upon the expressions "odium theologicum" and "polemical discussions."

Your Lordship and, I think, the public must see that your statement of the proposition of General Evans does not differ from mine, and it is only in ascribing motives (the propriety of which is questionable) to him and Dr. Hellmuth in connection with it, that there can be any charge or any difference between your Lordship and myself.

You thought or "suspected" the motive was to benefit General Evans' property and to secure his son-in-law an Incumbency. Even if this was what really actuated them in making what appears to me to have been a very liberal proposition, can it be considered a very wrong or improper motive?

But is it possible that the expenditure of £3,000 in building the Church would have enhanced the value of the residue of General Evans' property to an equal extent? And was such an incumbency an object for Dr. Hellmuth to secure, considering his then position at Sherbrooke and Lennoxville and the acknowledged character of his high attainments?

Under all the circumstances, I must confess your Lordship's judgment seems to have been hastily formed, and if I had been one of the Montreal public to have passed an opinion upon your Lordship's rejection of the offer at the time, I would have been charitable enough to have supposed that your Lordship was mistaken, but actuated by the best of motives, and not in the least by any apprehension of the presence of an "Evangelical" Clergyman like Dr. Hellmuth in Montreal.

I have the honour to be,

Your obedient servant,

ADAM CROOKS.

To the Right Reverend
THE LORD BISHOP OF MONTREAL.