

interlineations and alterations it had undergone—I thought it right to make a copy of it, which I did with all possible despatch, and then having sealed the envelope, I sent the original the same evening by my own servant to Dr. Gray. *After* (not before) it had been so sent, I shewed my copy of the correspondence privately to some of my friends, and with the same permission, who also copied it; there being nothing in it of a secret or confidential character, but relating solely to subjects of the highest general concern. The date, which was many days anterior to the letter leaving Fredericton, has probably led to the mistake. Being an original draft, His Lordship doubtless dated it when he first sat down to pen it, and not having much leisure on his hands, could not complete it before the lapse of some days. It is strange that this should be called a breach of privacy, by those who made no scruple of hawking round the town the Bishop's private note to Dr. Gray, expressing "disapproval of one of the Books to which objections had been made."

With this exception, I shall pass over the first six pages of Dr. Bayard's pamphlet, as the matter they contain bears about the same relation to the "*Facts as they occurred at the late annual meeting of the Diocesan Church Society*," as the Goodwin Sands did to Tentorden steeple. That portion of the pamphlet is in truth no more than a very shallow and superficial review of the Rev. Mr. Coster's defence of a work called "*The Companion to the Prayer-book*." In which the Doctor displays as much knowledge of the subject as he does of Latin, where he says Mr. Coster, "*questionem resurgit*—renews this question." *Resurgo* happens to be a verb neuter; but perhaps this may be Doctors' Latin or Dog Latin—for Physic and the Dogs do sometimes go together. Now for the "*Facts*."

In the 7th page, Dr. B., after quoting some of the Articles of the Church Society, remarks "that the Lord Bishop assumed a prerogative not given by the Constitution, when he invited, as he did, on the preceding Sunday, non-subscribers to attend the meeting."

As Dr. B. has never, until lately, manifested the least interest in the affairs of the Society, it is not surprising that he should be unacquainted with its usages—one of which has ever been to admit non-subscribers as well as members to the General Anniversary Meetings. There is nothing in the Constitution prohibitory of such a course, and it has reason as well as custom to recommend it; as the publicity thus afforded tends to increase the number of subscribers, and exclusiveness forms no part of our Church system. Besides I am told, that the notice