

ing majority of the members present, as it manifested the pre-determination of the Bishop to have his own way in the election of officers.

The Lord Bishop of the Diocese, in both of his letters, to which I have already alluded, states, "that he had *withdrawn* *his approval* from the 'Companion to the Prayer Book,' and "that it should not be re-imported:" Again, "as I have *withdrawn my approbation*, on grounds deemed sufficient by me, "I am at a loss to know why you urge the same objections. "The book is withdrawn. *Cadit quæstio*." His Lordship's phraseology suggests some important questions. If approval is *withdrawn*, it implies that approval pre-existed; otherwise it could not have been withdrawn. His Lordship has not assigned "the grounds deemed sufficient by himself." He sanctioned the importation of the book; and his own language authorizes the conclusion, that he *once* approved of it. If the book was worthy of importation, it was surely worthy of a place in the Depository, and of protection from the Bishop who approved of it. Why then has it been withdrawn? Surely not to gratify a "*factions*" and "*packed party*." If the book contained nothing hostile to the doctrines of the Church of England, and was *ever* worthy of approval, it was his Lordship's duty to protect it with *continued* approbation, and to defend it from "*unfounded objections*." But if, on the other hand, the doctrines contained in the book are adverse to Protestantism, "*approval*" continued, or "*withdrawn*," is out of the question. Its exclusion from the Depository should be based upon unequivocal condemnation. The "*grounds*" of *objectionable doctrines*, would be "*deemed sufficient*," not only by his Lordship, but by the Laity. I ask his Lordship, *if* he did not, in common candour, accompany the expression of his disapproval, with the *causes* of it? Whatever may be his sentiments upon the subject, I assert that, in justice to the Laity throughout the Province, he ought to have given these "*grounds*." His Lordship's *mode of expression* has embarrassed the interpretation of it, and surrounded his disapproval with ambiguity. The question involves a principle. If the book is doctrinally objectionable, it should be *unequivocally* condemned. If it is doctrinally correct, it should be unequivocally defended. Principle should preponderate in the scale against "*factions*," "*packed parties*," and *expedience*.

It was stated by a gentleman in the late meeting of the Diocesan Church Society, that he foresaw, that the questions which have divided the Episcopal Church in England, would, sooner or later, divide the Church in this Province; and he regretted that the subject had been brought before the meeting of the Society to disturb its peace and harmony. I duly appreciate