—they could assert their rights by passive resistance. They would be disloyal to their country—they would be traitors to themselves, and traitors to posterity, if by any act of their own they assisted in establishing this form of constitution in the colony. No man should become a district councillor—no man should be elected to the legislature; they were physically weak—by passive resistance they would triumph; they were bound to maintain their rights against the world—to resist England herself on such an occasion, not from hostility or opposition to the British Government, but from love and veneration for British laws and institutions." Mr. J. Macarthur truly remarked:—"If they were to be subjected to such experiments at the will of the Colonial Minister of the day, there would be no political education among them, or it would be loose, uncertain, unstable—to the ruin of the political character of the colonists." Mr. Murray's preponderance of ceremony is nicely balanced by Mr. Dignam:—"A previous speaker considers, that from the position and connexion of the noble Lord at the head of the Colonial Office, he is entitled to every forbearance on our part. For what? His presumption, in attempting, unaided by practical information from those most concerned, changes so momentous! for his precocious gift to New Zealand and promised one to this colony? His position only makes him a most dangerous enemy to our future welfare." In short, the same opinions and sentiments which have been unanimously expressed on similar occasions, and the like determination to resist to the uttermost, any innovation on the established form and usages of our present constitution such as that proposed by Earl Grey, have been unanimously and fully demonstrated on the present occasion. In the face of such a broad and unequivocal expression on the part of the colonists, we can scarcely think that Earl Grey will have the hardihood or the pertinacity to insist on the enforcement of his visionary scheme.

THE CHIEF JUSTICE AND THE JURY IN THE CASE OF JOHN TERRY HUGHES.

ADOPTING the style of observation in which our contemporary the *Herald* of Monday last, is kind enough to inform its readers that there are not many points of resemblance between an obscure party journal of this city and the ATLAS, we may remark, that although we do not often coincide with our aged contemporary, we have at length "found a subject on which we agree," and that is—the conduct of the Chief Justice in reference to the special jury who convicted John Terry Hughes.

Like our contemporary, we were "surprised", when we "perused" its report of the case; and, like our contemporary, we had strong "suspicions" that his Honor's observations respecting the jury had been "coined" for him, remembering at the time with what facility and pulpousness our friends inventive and concoctive powers have been exercised on former occasions. Finding, however, that his Honor did not correct the report, and that the *Herald* positively declared that it was not a concoction, we felt compelled like our friend to take it as truth and to deal with it accordingly, not merely however because his Honor did not correct the report, nor yet exactly because the *Herald* thought proper to testify to its truth. The duty of correction being a perpetual one, his Honor may have thought that to comply with it in this instance, would be to establish a "precedent" so exceedingly important, as eventually to effect a considerable accession to the ordinary business of his office. His non-interference might, therefore, have been attributed, not to the "non-existence of offence," but to what his honor might have considered the inexpediency of "accusation." And on the other hand, it was not unnatural to suppose that the *Herald* should evince as much facility in testifying to, as in inventing a report. Nor were we altogether wrong, for we have since witnessed, as regards the Chief Justice, a partial, and as regards the *Herald*, a complete confirmation of our suspicions. In last Wednesday's issue, which is the succeeding one to that containing the strictures on the conduct of his Honor, a report appears (evidently from or at the instance of the Chief Justice) which, although similar in some respects, is essentially different from, and corrective of, that which our contemporary had previously given as the true one. Thus showing that the *Herald's* report was not only a concoction, but also that the Chief Justice did not deem it necessary to correct it, until arraigned before the editorial tribunal to answer for his misdeeds, when probably the course he adopted may have been suggested by some such soliloquy as the following:—"Well, it is very hard to be charged with that of which one is not guilty; but it is still worse to be censured for it. The same benevolence which induced the invention of a speech for me, should have been equally exemplified in protecting me from the baleful effects of its bastardy. Since, therefore, the latter has been neglected, I think I may with safety despise the former—the obligation imposed by the one being more than cancelled by the non-fulfilment of the duty of the other." Hence the moral nudation of the *Herald* by the subsequent report. Now, all this may appear to be very funny to some, if not perfectly harmless; to our minds, however, it bears rather a different aspect. Although we cannot but admit that conduct so vacillating on the part of a public journal, is well calculated to excite a strong sense of the ludicrous, we must nevertheless affirm that it is equally provocative of indignation.

On his Honor's conduct, however, we find some difficulty in commenting, in consequence of the obscurity in which it has been brought before the public. As we have before observed, there are two reports of his Honor's speech respecting the Jury, but it is not stated whether they both refer to the same part, or to two distinct parts—whether the subsequent one is a correction of, or merely an addition to, the former—a repudiation, or mere explanation of questionable conduct. The latter would appear to be the true supposition, if the heading to the second report be correct, which states, not that this report is a correction or denial of the former, but merely an *omission*—thus:—"We have been requested to publish the following report of what fell from the Chief Justice in this case (J. T. Hughes') on the application of Mr. Lowe, that the prisoner might be admitted to bail, and which was *omitted* by the reporter." This, however, can scarcely be the case, since the same facts are recorded and dealt with as in the former report. We must therefore consider the second as a repudiation of its predecessor, and the *Herald's* attempt to make the public believe that it was only an omission as a piece of consistent duplicity. The following is the substance of the statement in question:—"Now as he (the Chief Justice) had said the day before on a similar application from the defendant, he had *discharged his own duty* by laying every consideration that occurred to him, both in support of and against the charge, fully before the jury. He might add, (and he was sure the defendant's counsel would assent to the statement) he had done this as *favourably for the defendant* as was possible. And if, *after this*, the jury had pronounced *Mr. Hughes* guilty, was it for him to say that they were wrong. The constitution had placed the decision in their hands, and *for the purpose of the present application*, therefore, their decision should be taken to be right. The *propriety* of their verdict, indeed, would come in question on the motion for a new trial, and on that occasion, or when called on to consider the sentence (should the decision be against the prisoner on the points of law) it would become necessary for him, and he should then be prepared to express his opinion on the subject. In the present stage, the duty of the Court simply was, to act on the verdict which had been pronounced; and the application for bail, therefore, could not be complied with." Now with all due deference to his Honor, (for whom we entertain deep respect), we do not think that he has thoroughly cleared himself of the charge of having passed a somewhat offensive, though doubtless an unintentional reflection on the jury. The foregoing statement contains such stale and apparently uncalled for truisms, as to lead us to believe, were we not informed to the contrary, that no gentleman in his Honor's position would have used them, unless for some sinister purpose. If otherwise, where, it may be asked, is the point of expressions from the Bench such as "I have discharged *my own* duty"—"the constitution had placed the decision in their (the jury's) hands," &c.? These observations are either applicable or inapplicable; if the latter they require no comment—if the former, where we should like to know is their applicability, if not as a reflection upon the jury. We are not aware that any one said that his Honor did *not* discharge his duty,—that the constitution did *not* place the decision in the hands of the jury—that he did *not* charge the jury "as *favorably* for the defendant as was possible"—or even "after *this*" that the jury did *not* find Hughes guilty. The mere fact of his Honor telling the Court that he had done his duty, was no more information to the Court than it was likely to be peculiarly convincing, because it came from *himself*. And as we can scarcely suppose that his Honor would deliberately have taken the trouble to affirm that which he knew every one in the Court must have known, and which could not but be considered as ambiguous, we must accuse him of at least an indiscretion, not more unworthy himself than offensive to the jury.

That this is no forced conclusion will be seen, not only from a consideration of the expressions we have noticed, but from a comparison of the first and last parts of the above statements. In the last part his Honor acknowledges that he cannot legally pass any opinion upon the verdict of the jury, except on the occasion of a motion for a new trial, or when called on to consider the sentence. In the first part he remarks that, he had charged the jury "as *favourably* for the defendant as was possible," which is saying in other words that, it was his opinion the verdict should have been for the defendant, and not as it was for the plaintiff. It is impossible to interpret this expression in any other way. If the charge to the jury was favourable for the defendant, it could not be favourable for the plaintiff too; or, in other words, if the charge was such as to suggest a verdict for the defendant, it could not also suggest a verdict for the plaintiff. As his Honor then directly admits that his charge to the jury was favourable for the defendant, the necessary implication is, that it was his Honor's opinion that the defendant was entitled to the verdict; and this revelation having been made in the first part of the report, the attempt to conceal it in the last part until the motion for a new trial, may be considered as "null and void." The inference from this is the same as that which we have previously deduced, viz., that his Honor has passed an unwarranted though doubtless unintentional reflection upon the jury.

Were it not that one of the jurymen has elicited a most candid and satisfactory explanation from his Honor to the effect that no censure was *intended*, we should certainly have pushed this subject much further than we have done. But as it is, we gladly dismiss it in the hope that we may never have cause to resume it. We regard the functions of jurymen as of nearly equal power and importance with those of the bench, and we, therefore, can see no reason why they should not be exercised with equal dignity and independence.

THE PAIR THAT'S AWA'.

Here's to the pair that's awa'
To their baptism, penance, and a',
And here's to the scarlet old lady they've made
The bride of the pair that's awa'.

Here's to the Bishop that led
His priests within Babylon's wa',
And fear not, my jolly apostates, he said,
We'll soon join the pair that's awa'.

And here's to the Bishop whose lust
Is for power o'er great and o'er sma';
And true to his word, as he's false to his trust,
May he soon join the pair that's awa'.

Here's to Bob Campbell, whose loof *
Can't distinguish 'twixt sawdust and straw;
And, oh! if these prodigals wanted a coof,†
He's the thing for the pair that's awa.

* Hand. † Calf.

THE BISHOP OF SYDNEY.

Dr. Broughton is the most unfavourable specimen of the Anglican Church in its present waning condition; like one of our re-consecrated cathedrals, he illustrates the presence of the Episcopal See, its discipline, authority and title, as it were *in stone*. The groined arch is there, the shafted pillar, the altar and the choir, but where are the services of prayer and praise? He assumes the dominant tone, rule and position of the Papal See, he founds himself upon the Apostolical Succession, his roots are in the Sacraments and Ordinances, incommunicable save by his own ministers. The dignity and authority to which all religionists should bow, are in the *Conges d'elire* of Anglican Bishops; and his are the Mitre and the Crosier, the Benediction and the Anathema. In a word he would arrogate, in things trivial, the self-sufficiency of the Puseyite, whose only Romish tendency in heart is, to fill the Holy See, with the incumbent of Cantuar, and to place at the disposal the clergy, the consciences and properties of the Laity, but where is the devotion of the Priest, the enthusiasm of the preacher, the intelligence and activity of the missionary Bishop, where that awful solemnity of their daily worship, that practical obedience, that unswerving fidelity, that unquestionabe piety and that unshaken belief which makes us respect the honesty of the Roman Catholic, while we regret the puerilities of his creed, the stumbling blocks of his practical worship, or the errors of his doctrinal converse.

The Constitution of the Anglican Church in Australia is, as elsewhere, a fruit fair to look upon, but is a shell and a shell only, it is an Altar without a Fire; It wants charity and humility, it wants zeal, it wants devotion, it wants the gifts of preaching and of prayer, and above all, it wants Doctrinal Consistency and Spiritual Independence. Why need we to wonder then at the defection, over which has been raised the lament of the Metropolitan, his Archdeacon and his Presbyters? We trust that for the credit of a sterner truth, and a warmer faith, such a mockery will not be re-enacted in Melbourne or in Geelong, as making an address of condolence to a Bishop, who has alienated by his own errors, two of his subordinate Ministers, and driven them to seek refuge for their bewildered minds, in the arms of the Romish Church.—*Corio Chronicle.*

Original Correspondence.

STEAM SHIP *JUNO.*

Mr. ATLAS—It was only a few days ago that I saw the Letter of Mr. Thompson, late first mate of the *Juno* steam ship, in *Bell's Life in Sydney*, and beg you will insert this note, not in his favour but as his due:—I was a passenger in that vessel from Adelaide, and I do most conscientiously declare that the imputations injurious to his character, referred to, are without foundation; and I do not believe one of our numerous passengers could be found, who would, if they were aware of these imputations, allow them to pass, without coming forward to contradict them. We all hate injustice and ought to expose it. I believe I may state the whole of us were made happy and comfortable by the conduct of Capt. Kirsopp, and his urbanity and real kindness were always seconded by that of Mr. Thompson. However, some men presume on the fact of their passing riches, but when they do so, in the eyes of all educated and sensible men they become despicable.

I now wish Mr. ATLAS, to ask Mr. Benjamin Boyd—how it happens that persons taking their passage from Adelaide, by the *Juno*, have to pay, when they pay their fare there, five shillings each—steward's fees; and how it happens when they arrive in Sydney, they should be expected to fee the stewards; for I assure you sir, they state most positively that they never receive one farthing of this fee paid in advance, and yet this fee is positively in the bill and receipt received there. Now, I mean to say that unless the stewards receive these fees, it is downright imposition; and if they do, and practise this misrepresentation to extort more, it is shameful, in either case Mr. Benjamin Boyd is bound to explain,

I am, Mr. Editor,

ONE WHO HATES IMPOSITION AND INJUSTICE IN ANY SHAPE.

THE SURPLICE AND THE OFFERTORY.

"Omnis novitas nocet in vulgo."—MELANCTHON.

Mr. ATLAS—Since I last addressed you on the subject of the surplice and the offertory, I have been comparing the Rubric of Edward the Sixth with the Canons of our Church, and I can see no reason to alter the opinions which I have already expressed. The use of the surplice in *divine service* is especially enjoined in the 58th Canon, and it is upon this canon that the rubricians principally rely. "Every minister saying the public prayers, or ministering the sacraments, or other rites of the church shall wear a decent and comely surplice with sleeves" But, sir, according to the Canons of the Church, what is *divine service?* In the preface to the Book of Common Prayer, "the common prayers in the church" are called "divine service," and if you refer to Canons 18, 19, 23, and 56, you will perceive that there is a manifest distinction between "divine service," and the "sermon or preaching;" and, therefore, although in the former the "surplice" is enjoined, in the latter it would appear, according to Canon 74, that the "gown" is perfectly in order, for it distinctly states that "All Deans, Masters of Colleges, Archdeacons, and Prebendaries, &c., &c., having any ecclesiastical living shall usually wear gowns with standing collars and sleeves strait at the hands, or wide sleeves, as is used in the Universities." For those who differ from this view of the canons and adopt the notion that the sermon or preaching is a part of the Communion Service, are bound to wear, as I showed in my last communication, "a white alb plain with a vestment or cope." Between the rubrics for the communion and the canons, there appears a little inconsistency, for while a rubric directs that the sermon or homily shall immediately follow the Nicene Creed (and this has been scrupulously followed by some of the innovators of the present day, who proceed with the sermon forthwith, omitting the usual Collect and Lord's Prayer), the 55th Canon especially enjoins a form of Prayer, or a prayer to the effect of that given to be used by all preachers before their sermons, "always concluding with the Lord's Prayer." As, therefore, there is evidently some obscurity in the matter, custom must be the interpreter; and perhaps it may be found that in the reign of Queen Elizabeth the preacher frequently delivered the sermon without either surplice or gown. Burnett says that there was "great diversity of practice, many conforming in all points to the law; while others did use neither the surplice, or the square caps and hoods according to their degree." This diversity led to an ecclesiastical commission, which determined that "in the Sacrament, the principal minister was to wear a cope; but *at all other prayers*, only surplices." An archbishop of that day (Grindal) in his injunctions for the laity distinguishes between "divine service," and "the sermon;" and in giving directions for the perambulation of the circuit of every parish yearly, expressly orders that the homily for Rogation week shall be read "without *wearing any surplices*, carrying of banners or handbells, or staying at crosses, or such like popish ceremonies." And here I may remark, that the most eminent divines, in the reign of Elizabeth were inclined to go a step further than the conservative clergy of the present day, and to discard the surplice altogether! "Except Archbishop Parker, who had remained in England during the late reign, and Cox, Bishop of Ely, who had taken a strong part at Frankfort against innovations, all the most eminent churchmen, such as Jewell, Grindal, Sandy's, Newell, were in favour of leaving off the surplice"—(Hallam's Const. Hist. p. 188) Indeed, the fondness of the Queen for splendour and magnificence in public worship, seems to have been the principal reason why surplices, copes, &c., were retained at all in the Church of England. Archbishop Grindal, as we have already seen, was decidedly opposed to them, and although after his decease Whitgift attempted by severe measures to enforce conformity, the attempt proved unsuccessful and occasioned a perpetual schism in the Church. At the period of the restoration we find that a large body in the Church, with a view of healing the divisions which had so long prevailed, actually proposed, amongst other things, that the surplice should be laid aside *altogether*, except in the Royal Chapel and in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches. This was published in the King's Declaration, (Charles II.) but it does not appear that Charles was sincere in the matter, for in 1662 the famous Act of uniformity was passed, by which 2000 of the most eminent and pious divines were deprived. Archbishop Tillotson and Bishop Burnett shortly after the Revolution of 1688, made another attempt to satisfy the scruples of the non-conformists, and proposed as one article for adoption, by the Ecclesiastical Commission, that "the use of the surplice should be left to the discretion of the bishop." Thus upon a reference to history we find that some of the most distinguished prelates of the Church—men whose writings will be read and admired until time shall be no more—were willing for the preservation of peace and the prevention of schism in the Church, to give up the surplice even in "divine service." What then shall we think of that policy in the Church which would wound the consciences of a large body both of the clergy and laity, by enforcing the use of the surplice on all occasions, whether in the time of "divine service," or "the sermon?" At the present day, there is no dispute about using the surplice during the time of prayers. Members of the Church of England, long accustomed to the decency and order which have existed in the performance of Divine Service, are not waging war against the surplice *in toto*, but merely during the delivery of the sermon; for they do not find in the rubric or the canons of the Church anything against the use of the gown; and moreover, from the practice of the clergy for so many generations, they are led to conclude that it never could have been the intention of the Church to enforce the use of the surplice excepting in "Common Prayer," or "Divine Service." When, therefore, they see the black gown thrown aside in their Churches, and the surplice worn during the sermon, they look upon the change with suspicion, and regard it as an unauthorised innovation; in this colony especially, where a different practice has prevailed, and where two Archdeacons have been accustomed to preach in black, the public mind is not prepared for any unnecessary alterations; and now too that the surplice has become the livery of Tractarianism, the people are doubly jealous; for when a man commences with one step towards Puseyism, there is no possibility of determining where he will stop, or indeed if ever he will stop at all until he is reconciled to the "Holy See." There are clergymen in this colony, I am aware, who have adopted the surplice from various motives. Some think it will please the Bishop to do so, while others from a misconception of the case (their eyes being filled with the dust of Tractarianism) actually imagine that it is a part of their duty to preach in a surplice! But I would ask these gentlemen who pretend to adhere so strictly to the rubric and the canons, do they follow them in all particulars? What authority have they in the rubric for a flourish of the organ at the commencement of the service, or for the "Glory be to thee, O! God," before the gospel? What authority have they for not performing the marriage ceremony in the body of the Church, or for not dipping the child when baptizing it, if the God-fathers and God-mothers certify that it may well endure the same? Why when administering the Lord's Supper, do they not wear an alb and a cope? Why do they not, according to the *letter* of Canon 55, pray for King James, Prince Henry, and Queen Anne? And why, according to Canon 74, do they not wear priest's cloaks in their journeys, without guards, welts, long buttons or cuts, and only plain nightcaps in the day time? To these and a multitude of other questions which might with justice be put to our Puseyite friends, no satisfactory answer can be given *on their own principles*, for if they are bound to revive one obsolete ceremony or rite, they are bound to revive them all; and if they are so scrupulous about one part of the clerical dress, they must adopt the whole. The fact is, sir, that rites and ceremonies are but of human invention, and what is suited to one age would appear perhaps ridiculous in another. If, therefore, for the sake of argument, it were admitted that the use of the surplice in the service is according to the Canons, so are cloaks with sleeves and black silk night-caps; and if according to the Rubric, the Clergy are compelled to baptize publicly after the Second Lesson, so are they equally bound to keep up Guy Fawkes's day with due reverence, and if there be no sermon, to read one of the six Homilies against Rebellion?

The collection of alms and oblations at the Offertory, when *there is no communion*, is decidedly opposed to the practice of the Apostles; for if on the first day of the week they made their gatherings for the poor (1 Cor., xvi., 2), so also on the same day did they break bread (Acts, xx., 7.); and from the earliest account of the Christian assemblies in Justin Martyr (*Apologia Prima*, 68), it is quite clear that the Lord's Supper and the Offertory (if I may be allowed the term) went both together, for he distinctly states that it was the custom of his day, after the administration of the Eucharist, to make collections for the poor, the widow and the orphan, the sick and afflicted:—"Qui abundant et volunt, suo arbitrio, quod quisque vult, largiuntur, et quod colligitur apud eum qui præest deponitur, ac ipse subvenit *pupillis et viduis, et iis qui ob morbum vel aliam ob causam egent, &c., &c.*" And no doubt our Venerable Reformers, being well read in the Fathers of the Church, were desirous of restoring the practice of the Primitive Church as far as they practically could do so. And hence an enlightened historian of the Reformation, in reviewing the Communion Service, observes:—"It is clear, that when there were persons to communicate *(which the Rubric seems to presume would always be the case on Sundays)* the Litany and Communion went together; and that when there were none such, still the Litany was immediately followed by the Communion Service as far as to the end of the prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church Militant." How long this arrangement continued (Query?—*Was it ever generally adopted?*) does not appear; but whether from the difficulty of gathering together a congregation at *break of day*, discipline being now relaxed, or from whatever cause, within the first century after the Reformation, the Church seems to have lapsed into the present practice, and to have combined its services into one." Grindal, in his injunctions for the laity, directs (No. 9) that the Minister shall not pause or stay between the morning prayer, litany, or communion, but shall continue and say the morning prayer, litany, and communion—or the service appointed to be said when there is no communion—together, without intermission; but he orders a bell to be knolled before a sermon. And with respect to the alms for the poor, he orders that according to a statute of the 5th year of Elizabeth, collectors shall gather weekly the charitable almose of the parishioners, and distribute the same to the poor, where most need shall be, without fraud or partiality, and shall quarterly make unto the parson, vicar, or curate, and churchwardens, a just account thereof in writing; and (No. 17 in the articles to be inquired of within the Province of Canterbury) he inquires whether the clergy are diligent in visiting the sick, and whether they move them earnestly, especially when they make their testaments, to consider the necessity of the poor, and to give to their box or chest their charitable devotions or almose? From these and other passages of his writings, it is reasonable to conclude that in the days of Elizabeth, when there was no communion, the service generally ended with the prayer for the church militant. Indeed the Archbishop gives a direction to that effect in one of his forms of Common Prayer (*vid.* page 84, Parkhurst Society's edition). I cannot find, however, any particular order for reading the offertory and making a collection when there was no communion, and even the omission of the words "alms and oblations," in the prayer for the church militant, seems to show that when the service ended, as I have before stated, there were none at all, and the ordinary collections for the poor were to be made by persons duly appointed according to the Act of Elizabeth. This may not be exactly expressed in the Rubric, but it is evidently implied, just in the same way that it is understood the non-communicant shall leave the church before the celebration of the Lord's Supper, although there is nothing in the Rubric to that effect. The custom of making collections in the church during the reading of the offertory, *when there is no communion*, seems opposed to the principles of our Reformers, as it might be considered objectionable on the ground of reviving a custom which Burnett most expressly condemns, viz.: that of inducing the laity to believe it sufficient for them "to come to the Sacrament" and make an oblation, though they did not communicate. (Book 1st, part 2.) This error, the worthy Bishop attributes to the want of fervour which pervaded the Church in the fourth and fifth centuries. How long the practice of concluding the service with the Prayer for the Church Militant continued, cannot be determined, as a clever writer remarks, or whether that method was ever universally adopted by the Church of England; but in the days of the great Dr. Barrow—one of the brightest luminaries of our Church—it is evident that the service concluded with the Sermon. On one occasion (to relate a curious anecdote respecting the Doctor) when preaching in Westminster Abbey, the hour allowed for the Sermon had expired, and a multitude of people, had, as usual, assembled for the purpose of viewing the interior. The servants, who saw no prospect of a termination of the service, and trembled for the loss of the customary gratuities, at last could refrain no longer, but "caused the organ to be struck up against him, and would not give over playing till they had blowed him down."

In conclusion, sir, I would express a hope that the recent "perversions" may convince the Clergy and Laity generally, of the tendency of Tractarianism, and may lead them to see that, under an apparent zeal for rubrics and canons, a great deal of mischief may be done. People well affected towards the Church, are much injured by such unauthorised innovations, and they lose confidence in their pastors when week after week introduces something new. One would have imagined, sir, after all the sufferings of our reformers, that the doctrines and discipline of our church had been thoroughly established, and that both clergy and laity would be content with those rites and ceremonies which have received the sanction of so many venerable and distinguished prelates and divines. Are we, in these days, to forsake the paths of our fathers, and to go on a voyage of discovery after some venerable absurdity? Are we to discard the plain precepts and heavenly doctrines of our blessed Saviour and his apostles, as delivered to us in the holy scriptures, and to search after fanciful interpretations and foolish superstitions in the fathers? God forbid! Are we to set at nought all the wisdom and piety of our Jewells, Tillotsons, Barrows, Seckers, and Portend's, and to chose for our guides the ever changing disciples of Newman and Pusey? I trust, sir, that the church of this colony will adopt a wiser course, and by rejecting every rite or ceremony which has a leaning towards that awful precipice, into which so many have already fallen, that she will emerge from her temporary difficulties and rise to renewed strength and usefulness.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
A CHURCHMAN.

ANOTHER SPEC FOR A BISHOP'S CEMETERY.

Mr. ATLAS—This week there is "a public notice of a petition to the Legislative Council for leave to introduce a Bill to empower Trustees of the Glebe, appertaining to the Parish of St. James, to convey a portion of the same as the site of a Church, Parsonage House, School House, and Cemetery, to the Trustees of the intended Church of St. Mark, in the parish of Alexandria, in exchange &c." A Cemetry annexed, in a populous neighbourhood, and within the boundaries of the city! This is really what may be called a Smart "affair," a Mortal "dodge," and a "Whistler," from a Smith, in *propries personis* of the Trustees of the intended church of St. Mark, acting on behalf of the Right Reverend Father in God; since not like Abraham, the head of the branch of some church cannot purchase even by shares, a Cave of Macphelah to bury his dead. That the Legislative Council will grant the prayer of the petition in direct violation of the Imperial Act—"what an idea!"

OLD MORTALITY.

March 14, 1848.

ESSAY ON PUSEYISM.

Mr. ATLAS—In common with many of your readers, I thank you for the publication, in a separate form, of the able article on Puseyism in the *Edinburgh Review*—an article which cannot fail to produce a deep impression upon those whose perspicacity, and freedom from prejudice, qualify them to understand it. You have done the community excellent service. I most earnestly wish a second edition may be speedily called for, and that every minister of Christ, Catholic and Protestant, may be disposed to study and digest its momentous principles.

I think, Mr ATLAS, you have in common with many others, fallen into an error respecting the authorship of the said article. It is *not*, I believe, the production of the elegant and well-stored mind of Macaulay, but of the Rev. Henry Rogers, Independent minister, who has a brother, or half-brother in this city. My reasons for ascribing the authorship to Mr. Rogers are as follow:—1st, *I think* the internal evidence is in favor of the conclusion that it is *not* Macaulay's production. It indicates an extent of theological reading, or at any rate a minute and *con amore* acquaintance with religious writers, that could hardly be expected in a writer on general and miscellaneous literature. But, 2nd, I was informed by a highly literary gentleman, who knows Mr. Rogers, and who was in Europe when the article first appeared, that Mr. Rogers was its author, and that he received a hundred guineas for writing it* from the conductors of the Review.

I have written these few lines on the principle of "giving to every one his due." If you judge them worthy a place in your excellent paper, you will oblige

AN OBSERVER.

P.S.—Could you not favor the public with the admirable sermon of Dr. Cumming, which appeared in the *Herald* of Tuesday, in a form at once cheap and convenient? Dr. Cumming is well known to have diligently studied the Romish and Tractarian controversies for several years, and the result has been to bring him from rather high notions to take his stand with those who regard a "true ministry" as a "ministry of truth," rather than as the creature of ecclesiastical legerdemain. He is also master of a copious and popular rhetoric by which he does ample justice to his researches.

[As to the authorship of the pamphlet entitled "Puseyism," we were misinformed at the time of its publication. Since then we have had reason to see that we were mistaken in ascribing it to Mr. Macaulay, and we have great pleasure in giving our correspondent an opportunity of furnishing the public with the name of the real author. The publisher of the ATLAS would be most happy to reprint the sermon alluded to in a cheap form, if a sale sufficient to meet the expenses were guaranteed.—ED. ATLAS.]

* Now published by you for sixpence.