

ington to Baltimore, to test its practicability and utility, dragged its slow length along, and the close of the sessions of 1842 and '43 threatened a result as inauspicious as the previous sessions of 1837 and '38. I need not more than allude to the fact that in the previous session of 1837, I had expended all the pecuniary means I possessed to sustain myself at Washington while urging upon the attention of Congress this then untried, this then esteemed visionary enterprise of an electric telegraph.—Years were required to put myself again in a pecuniary condition to appear before Congress with my invention, and now I saw the last day of another entire session about to close, and with it the prospect of still another year's delay. My bill had indeed passed the house. It was on the calendar of the Senate, but the evening of the last day had commenced with more than one hundred bills to be considered and passed upon before mine could be reached. Wearied with the anxiety and suspense, I consulted with one of my senatorial friends; he thought the chance of reaching it so small that he advised me to consider it as lost. In a state of mind I must leave you to imagine, I returned to my lodgings to make my preparations for returning home the next day. My funds were reduced to the fraction of a dollar. In the morning, as I was about to sit down to breakfast, the servant announced that a young lady desired to see me in the parlor. It was the daughter of my excellent friend and college class-mate, the commissioner of patents. She called, she said, by her father's permission, and in the exuberance of her own joy, to announce to me the passage of the telegraph bill at midnight, but the moment before the Senate's adjournment. This was the turning point of the telegraph invention in America. As an appropriate acknowledgement for her sympathy and kindness, a sympathy which a woman can feel and express, I promised that the first despatch by the first line of Telegraph from Washington to Baltimore should be indited by her. To which she replied, "I will hold you to your word." In about a year from that time, the line was completed, and everything being prepared I apprised my young friend of the fact. A note from her enclosed this despatch: "What hath God wrought!" These were the first words that passed upon the electric wires, on the first completed line in America.

Place me where you will, then, gentlemen, in the chain of instrumentalities, I look behind me and before me, and see in the vista of the past and of the future a long procession of co-operators, without whom, my thought, however brilliant, could never have been realized. To them all, whether present or absent, I would render here the homage of my thanks. I claim for my reward the gratification I cannot but feel, with an intensity which I can scarcely find words to express, that the favourite dream of three and twenty years of my life, whose realization I have cherished day and night, to wit, that universal humanity is to be bound in a true social fraternity by instantaneous inter-communication of thought, is now near its consummation."

10, 'The Press—the recognized voice of public opinion—may it always speak for the advancement of knowledge and the improvement of society.' This toast was elegantly and tersely responded to by Bayard Taylor. I regret that space will not permit me to give you the outlines of his remarks, which were received with much applause. 11, 'The Ladies—whose eyes were the first electric telegraphs—may they never fail in forming a connection.' This last (and I might add best) toast was acknowledged by Fitz James O'Brien in his own characteristic and spirited style. Some volunteer toasts ended the dinner, which will long be remembered with pleasure by all who were fortunate enough to be present.

Thursday evening a ball was given for us at the Province building, which did great credit to the taste and good feeling of our hospitable entertainers. The hall was beautifully decorated—the star spangled banner's mingling gracefully with the 'union jack,' and the provincial flag of green, on which is emblazoned the harp of Old Erin. One rarely sees so much beauty as the ladies of Newfoundland possess, combined with much sprightliness and grace; but they lack that distinguished air for which the American ladies are famed, and one of our party, a New York belle, moved about like a queen among them. The dancing continued until a late hour; we poor people who had been confined on ship-board for a fortnight thinking it a favorable opportunity for a little exercise; and to end in a story-book style, we all reached home (that is our ship) 'dreadfully tired and very happy.'

ARCHDEACON SHORTLAND AND THE BISHOP OF MADRAS.

The Indian papers publish a letter from Archdeacon Shortland, relating the particulars of a disagreement with the Bishop of Madras relative to proceedings connected with an alleged preaching of unsound doctrine by the Rev. H. Taylor, the senior chaplain of the cathedral. The following are the passages of the sermon preached on the fourth Sunday after Epiphany, 28th January, 1855:—

"We do not regard the bread and wine merely as signs or emblems. We rather consider them as becoming, through the act of consecration, the body and blood of the Saviour, and as such the vehicles of grace to the believer."

"We cannot, therefore, regard the Holy Communion as nothing more than a solemn commemoration, calculated to nourish holy thoughts and pious dispositions. We must regard it as an instituted means for the communication of grace, the vehicle of communion being the consecrated symbols, which, though they substantially remain bread and wine, effectually represent the crucified Christ."

"Some excitement," says the Archdeacon, "was created among a few of the persons attending the cathedral; and Sir William Burton, puisne judge of the Supreme Court addressed a letter to the Lord Bishop, stating that in the course of the sermon the Rev. H. Taylor 'expressed himself clearly, unequivocally, and unqualifiedly as follows:—

"By the act of consecration the bread and wine becomes the body and blood of Christ."

"He said, moreover, that our Church in the Catechism teaches (or says) the same thing, in the words 'which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.'"

"Meanwhile, the Archdeacon, being on the most intimate terms with the Lord Bishop, wrote to his lordship several private and (the Archdeacon maintains) privileged communications, remarking on the subject in a confidential style; to which, however, he to his great surprise, was not favored with any reply whatever. Most of the clergy in the neighbourhood of Madras were in the habit of meeting at his house on the first Tuesday in each month; and, understanding that many unfounded reports were in circulation relative to Mr. Taylor's sermon, and that errors of the most serious character were 'spread abroad,' I felt it right on one of these occasions, to read to them an extract from the sermon, and, on a subsequent occasion, a paper, in which his views on the subject were explained on "That the bread and wine by the act of consecration become spiritually the body and blood of Christ to the faithful receiver, although they substantially remain bread and wine;" at the same time, however, stating the intention with which I read the paper, and expressly requesting that no remark on the subject might be made." He guarded himself also from expressing any opinion on the doctrine contained therein. Some weeks elapsed, during which the Archdeacon had not been favoured with any communication whatever from the bishop, when at length, to his astonishment, he received a letter stating that it had been brought to his lordship's notice that he (the Archdeacon, had permitted the Rev. H. Taylor to read at his last clerical meeting an explanation of an extract from a sermon which he (the Bishop) had previously condemned, and told him no explanation could do away with the wrong impression its words were calculated to produce:—

"I cannot express to you the concern that I feel at your thus giving countenance to, and taking advantage of your position to uphold views which your Bishop has declared to be incompatible with the teaching of the Church of England. You ought to be my representative at the presidency, not my opponent."

"I consider too, that at a meeting which was called for other purposes, to bring forward a controversy on which your Bishop had to decide, was a most unwarranted proceeding, and one which, if repeated, must lead me to put an end to such meetings altogether."

"I have now to direct that at your next clerical meeting you read the accompanying papers without one word of note or comment by yourself or those present, and to request a large body of the clergy as possible to attend on the occasion."

"To this the Archdeacon answered, to the effect that a communication expressed in such terms was probably never before addressed by a Bishop to an archdeacon, and he could not recognise the Bishop's right thus imperatively to order what he should do, or say or not say, on the occasion of his receiving his reverend brethren in his own house, and at his own table. The most proper mode, the Archdeacon suggested, of making a formal communication of this nature to the reverend clergy, would be by assembling them at the cathedral for that purpose. The statement contained in the letter of Sir W. Burton was very seri-

ously incorrect. His lordship has been misinformed as to what occurred in his house on the occasion; he (the Archdeacon) himself read the paper explanatory of his views, requesting at the same time that there might be no discussion whatever on the subject; and there was none.

"Your lordship," the Archdeacon continues, "I must beg to remind you, did not favour me with a single line expressive of your judgment on this painful subject; but though you had done so, I should still have considered it highly expedient that the reverend clergy who favoured me with their company should be informed of the precise doctrines which had been preached, as thus only would they be able duly to understand and weigh the condemnation which it appears your lordship has pronounced."

A reply from the Bishop follows, in which he tells Archdeacon Shortland—

"From the very commencement of this unhappy business your conduct has been open to animadversion. To have made yourself a partisan, when a grave question of doctrine was referred to your Bishop, was an inexcusable fault in one in your position; but your extraordinary letters to me, in order to induce me to coincide with the views of the reverend chaplain's sermon, were most objectionable. Was it the way to speak of a subject which had been referred to the Bishop in most respectful language by a gentleman in an exalted situation, distinguished alike for his urbanity and attachment to the Church of England; 'This latter opinion may not square with Madras views, which I fear savour too much of Zwinglianism; but it is very extensively embraced and admitted in the Church of England; and not all the Sir W. Burtons in the world will ever bring the Bishops and clergy to see eye to eye on this controverted question.' And again—'It is now as ever in Madras—a few idle people run from house to house, tattling about matters of which they either know nothing, or at least should think of much more soberly and prayerfully, humbly too, until a ferment is excited.' I do not hesitate to say that your subsequent conduct in permitting Mr. Taylor to read his explanation or vindication of his views, when you well knew that the question was at that moment before your Bishop, was most improper, and I will add, the most outrageous act, in one in your relative position to the Bishop, that I have ever known; and if, as I further believe, you knew that the vindication was not an answer to misapprehensions of the congregation, but was an answer to the Bishop's letter to Mr. Taylor on the subject, condemnatory of his views, then it is impossible to use words too strong to mark the utter want of decency, and order, and propriety, in permitting it to be read."

"I now again repeat to you, that if ever another act of irregularity should occur, I shall feel it my duty to issue my injunction to forbid such meetings of the clergy."

"My condemnation of Mr. Taylor's views was founded solely and entirely on the extract from the sermon furnished by the rev. chaplain himself."

"I do not wonder at your forgetting your vow of canonical obedience in refusing to obey the Bishop's injunction to read the letters he forwarded to you (although it is difficult to imagine a more fitting place or opportunity than where the 'vindication' they are intended to condemn was read), when you can tell me in the last paragraph of your letter, that you should have considered it highly expedient, had you heard directly from myself my judgment condemnatory of the views in question, that the clergy, when called together for prayer and mutual edification, should be invited and enabled by you to canvass the merits of the judgment of their Bishop."

"But now, once for all, I must be permitted to say, in all truth and faithfulness, that I cannot regard your conduct in the whole of this unpleasant business, otherwise than as an attempt to usurp the Bishop's place and office."

"(a) You have prejudged an important point of doctrine, which you knew had been submitted to the Bishop for his consideration and decision, and endeavoured to induce him to coincide in your views without either reason or argument."

"(b) You have permitted a paper to be read to the clergy in vindication of views which your Bishop and Metropolitan have condemned as unsound. It is true you state 'I had not favoured you with a single line expressive of my judgment upon this painful subject,' but you tell me, if I had, you would still have considered it highly expedient that the rev. clergy present at the meeting, should be informed of Mr. Taylor's precise doctrines."

"(c) You have disobeyed the Bishop's directions to read his and the Metropolitan's letters containing their views on the subject, although one of these letters is a direct answer to the vindication permitted to be read at the meeting in question; and the Bishop maintains that the place where and the persons to whom the vindication had been read were most suitable for the reply."