BALTIMORE.

FRIDAY, MAY 28, 1858.

A few days since, a distinguished Senator declared in his place in Congress, that he did not believe there was "as corrupt a Government under the Heavens as that of the UNITED STATES." We do not know whether this is literally true. Our acquaintance with the practical working of the machinery of other Governments, in other parts of the world, is limited, and we are therefore unable to test the accuracy of Senator TOOMBS' statement, in respect to the *comparative* amount of corruption existing in our own. That the amount of *positive* corruption is enormous, we are quite satisfied, and if there be a people on the face of the globe, whose Government is more corrupt, Heaven help them. Mr. TOOMBS further stated his conviction that there is most corruption "in the Legislative departments" of Government. We do not doubt it. The Honorable Senator says so, and an Honorable Senator ought to know. Recent disclosures have fully prepared us to believe that such is the case. Only the other day, when Mr. RICE, one of the Senators elect from the new State of Minnesota, was sworn in, along with his credentials, there were presented to the Senate by Mr. HARLAN, of Iowa, charges against the Honorable Senator, of gross corruption. We know nothing about the truth or falsehood of these charges. We simply refer to the coincidence as being anything but agreeable, and as showing that CÆSAR's wife is, at all events, not above suspicion. Senator RICE may be as honest as any common man, but there are evidently people in the world who do not think so. In the other wing of the Capitol, the recent ignominious expulsion from office, of Mr. HACKNEY, the Door-Keeper of the House, shows how corruption has taken up its abode, at the very door-sill of the Legislative Chamber. The cases of MATTESON, GILBERT and others, during the last session, are evidence that it has not always remained on the outside of the threshold. On the contrary, Special Committees to investigate charges of corruption, against Honorable Members, have become almost as common in the lower House, as are Courts of Inquiry and Courts-Martial in the Army and Navy. The latest revelation of Legislative dishonesty is to be found, however, in the Report of a Committee of the Wisconsin Legislature appointed to look into the affairs of the LA CROSSE AND MILWAUKEE RAILROAD COMPANY, and to investigate the means used by that corporation to procure from the Legislature of 1856, a grant of lands belonging to the State, to aid in the construction of the Road. This Report discloses the fact of the wholesale bribery or "buying up" of the entire State Government of Wisconsin, for the purpose of obtaining that grant, and of the expenditure, with that view, of *nearly one million of dollars* by the President and Directors of the Company. The names of the officials who were bribed, and the exact amounts paid to each, are given in the Report. The list includes His Excellency the Governor of the State, COLES BASHFORD—the Honorable ARTHUR MCARTHUR, Lieutenant Governor,—WILLIAM M. DENNIS, ESQUIRE, Bank Comptroller, the Governor's Private Secretary, the Clerks of both Houses, thirteen Senators, and fifty-nine Assemblymen. Two hundred and forty-six thousand dollars were expended in buying "outsiders," lobby-agents, and others. Among these latter, figure three Editors, RUFUS KING of the *Milwaukee Sentinel*, MORITZ SCHAEFFER of the *Wisconsin Banner*, and S. D. CARPENTER of the *Wisconsin Patriot*. The aggregate sum paid to these journals, was $20,000,—an amount which appears ridiculously small when compared with that expended in the purchase of Senators and Assemblymen. When the former were quoted at $20,000 apiece, and the lowest bid offered for any of the latter was $5,000, it must be conceded that the Editors were cheap—dog-cheap. The highest price given was that paid for the GOVERNOR, who was bought for $50,000. Current market rates were about $10,000, payable in bonds of the Company. The manner in which the negotiations were conducted is detailed at length in the Report, and is quite amusing, not to say highly instructive and edifying. The Senators, it seems, were old birds not to be caught with chaff. They required payment of the purchase-money before they gave their votes for the bill.

Those to whom stock was assigned, had their amounts placed in the hands of William A. Barstow, before voting for the Land Grant bill, to be by him passed to them respectively in case the bill became a law. This precaution was taken, as they did not feel inclined to trust performance by the La Crosse Directors, after they had obtained the grant.

Sagacious Senators! Prudent precaution! In Wisconsin, it seems, there is not even honor amongst thieves. The Assemblymen were paid off by MOSES M. STRONG, Attorney for the Company, who on this occasion appears to have exercised the additional functions of Paymaster. The bonds designed for each person, were put up in "packages," marked with the names of the intended recipients, and left at the office of Mr. STRONG, who in his answers to the third and twenty-third interrogatories propounded by the Committee, says:

"All the packages to which I suppose the question refers, with a *very* few exceptions, were by me delivered to the persons whose names were written on them, respectively. In all the excepted cases, they were delivered to some other person who undertook to deliver them, and in whose undertaking I had confidence."

* * * "My office for a day or two was thronged with members of the Legislature and others, who I suppose, came there to receive the packages. I got rid of them as soon as possible."

* * * "I delivered the 'packages' in person, (with the exceptions heretofore mentioned,) and took no voucher or receipt from any person."

The delicate duty of bribing the Governor, was, as befitted the exalted dignity of that august personage, entrusted to no meaner hands than those of the President of the Road, BYRON KILBOURN, ESQUIRE. We shall let this worthy tell in his own words, how he managed the matter. There is a charming simplicity and *naivete* in his narrative, which no language of ours could convey. He states how he called on the Governor, and after an affecting interchange of agreeable compliments, delicately broached the business in hand by telling His Excellency—

—"that in consideration of the past and prospect of the future, the Company felt disposed to extend to him *a pecuniary compliment*, if he would feel at liberty to accept it. He said that, with the views and purposes expressed by me, *he should not feel at liberty to decline a compliment of the kind, and would accept of it cheerfully.* I then stated that I would at an early day place in his hands the bonds of the Company to the amount of $50,000; distinctly stating to him at the time that I wished this gratuity to have no influence upon any official act which it might henceforth devolve on him hereafter to perform. On his part, I believe he accepted it for the reason that he thought the Company could well afford to make such a donation without doing it any material damage, while *to him* the sum was large enough to confer a *real benefit* (!!) In pursuance of this conversation, I subsequently placed in the hands of Gov. BASHFORD the bonds of the Company to the amount of $50,000, and at a later period I exchanged with him $15,000 into money at par. * * I presume this would have been done from time to time had the condition of the Company permitted."

All this, Mr. KILBOURN professes to have done without any "corrupt intent," and uninfluenced by any "unworthy motive." It was solely, he says—

—"because I deemed it necessary to PROPITIATE HIS FEELINGS *with reference to the future operations of our Company.*

Observe the delicate Euphuism with which Mr. KILBOURN converts a bribe into "a pecuniary compliment," solely intended "to propitiate the feelings" of the exalted functionary to whom it was offered. What a nice distinction there is conveyed by this adroit use of language by the ingenious Mr. KILBOURN! What a world-wide difference there is, between the vulgar traffick carried on by the Company in Senators and Assemblymen, who were bought and sold, like cattle in the market, or negroes on the Slave-Coast, at so much a head, and the graceful act of "propitiating the feelings" of a Governor. No wonder that Governor BASHFORD's "feelings" did not leave him "at liberty to decline a compliment," so happily conceived, and so politely conveyed!

Altogether, we have never read anything more refreshing than is this delightful exposition of legislative morality in the virtuous State of Wisconsin. It makes us proud of our Western fellow-citizens. We feel honored by the connection. It increases our confidence in Western Railroad Securities, and our knowledge of the hidden mysteries of Railroad management. It augments our reverence for republican institutions, and for the purity of our legislation; and besides, it is calculated to do us good in the eyes of the civilized world, and to elevate our national character abroad.

Will our readers believe us, however, when we add that the perpetrators of this stupendous infamy, the men by whom this great scandal has been brought upon the American name and country, although convicted of the fact, in most instances, by their own confessions, which are appended to the Report, in the form of sworn answers to the interrogatories propounded by the Committee, have neither been brought to punishment, nor are ever likely to be made to suffer the penalties which are due to their crimes? Although the Committee brought in with their Report, the *projet* of a law designed to reach such cases in future, even that was killed by the personal and political influence of these self-convicted criminals. The Legislature has adjourned, without taking any action in the premises, and the sinners have been suffered to depart, without even an injunction to "sin no more." Other disclosures and revelations this Report likewise contains. The LA CROSSE Directors appear to have been no mean adepts in the occult science of Railway Financiering. They have found out cunning devices for throwing dust into the eyes of the public, and concealing the real condition of a corporation from the knowledge of its stockholders, compared with which, "Sinking Funds" and "Construction Accounts" are clumsy inventions. We shall keep the Report by us. It may perhaps serve a useful purpose in other and future investigations.

The days of the DERBY ministry are numbered. It had no root-hold from the first; but depended solely for its equipoise upon conciliating conflicting interests, and upon such chance support as it might obtain from incongruous materials. But no cohesion could be expected from a merely casual combination of sand and sea shells, drift and pebbles, such as the sea brings to the surface, in the height of a storm, and leaves heaped upon the beach, only to be separated and dispersed by the next returning wave. Personally, Lord DERBY is the most popular of all the Parliamentary leaders, but in his political principles, although they have been greatly modified of late years, he is still a quarter of a century behind the age. As an orator, he has few equals in either house, and no superior. Like CHARLES JAMES FOX he can win battles, but hurried away by his gallantry and fearlessness, he neglects the means of consolidating his power, and of improving his victories. Twelve years ago, BULWER, in his *New Timon*, characterized him as—

"The brilliant chief irregularly great,
Frank, haughty, rash,—the Rupert of Debate,
First in the class, and keenest in the ring,
He says like GLADSTONE and he fights like SPRING."

In the estimation of Englishmen, there is no one quality in a Statesman comparable to pluck, and it was the hesitancy evinced by Lord PALMERSTON in promptly rebuking an aspersion upon the national honor, which enabled MILNER GIBSON by throwing a single shell into the Ministerial fortress, to shiver it into fragments. That he who has so long worn the *sonbriquet* of "plucky PAM" should have wavered but for a single instant, was, of all the errors to which a political chief is subject, the one least likely to be overlooked either by his Parliamentary adherents or the public at large, and the natural consequences were—a vote of censure and the dissolution of the PALMERSTON Cabinet.—But the retiring Minister has the privilege of suggesting his successor, and it is quite probable that, in recommending the QUEEN to call Lord DERBY to the head of the Government, Lord PALMERSTON, knowing the incongruous elements of which the opposition was composed, anticipated for himself an early return to Power. Nor was Lord DERBY unaware of the difficulties he would have to encounter in accepting the Premiership under such circumstances. At the LORD MAYOR'S Banquet, he seized the occasion thus presented, to deprecate all factious opposition. He frankly admitted the disadvantages under which he labored and solicited, rather than demanded, a favorable consideration for the policy he proposed to adopt. What that policy would be he cautiously abstained from indicating, knowing full well that in order to maintain even the appearance of harmony among the discordant materials, to which he looked for support, it would be necessary so to shape his course, as to satisfy alike his immediate political friends, and that larger body of independent members, who were willing to give his Administration a fair trial.—With his position thus undefined, he assumed the reins of Government. The *Budget*—that formidable National balance-sheet usually so productive of controversy—was triumphantly mastered by D'ISRAELI; but with the introduction of the bill providing for the future government of India, the rocks ahead became distinctly visible. The first bill proposed, was extravagantly eulogized by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and then suffered to die a natural death. The second, proved equally unacceptable, and was almost bantered out of existence, by Lord PALMERSTON, on the evening of its presentation. A graver issue has since arisen. Lord ELLENBOROUGH has been intermeddling in the affairs of India, and in such a manner, as to give rise to mingled feelings of alarm and indignation. As President of the Board of Control, he undertook to censure Lord CANNING, the Governor General of India, for issuing his proclamation to the people of Oude. The dispatch, which was to have been a secret one, was published with the full cognisance of Lord ELLENBOROUGH, and was found not only to condemn the acts of Lord CANNING, but to justify the rebellion. Both Houses of Parliament immediately took action upon it. In the House of Lords, the Earl of SHAFTSBURY gave notice that he should move a resolution condemning the conduct of the Government, and in the Commons, Mr. CARDWELL made a similar announcement. Lord ELLENBOROUGH immediately resigned, and Lord DERBY expressed his regret that the dispatch had been published, acknowledging with his usual frankness, that it was premature and injudicious. But this atonement was not considered sufficient. Lord PALMERSTON promptly called his friends together, and obtaining the promise of support from Lord JOHN RUSSELL, MR. GLADSTONE, and the principal members of the so-called Peelite party, determined to fight the battle for political supremacy, upon the vantage ground thus afforded him. The issue, though it may be delayed by a coalition between Lord DERBY and the radicals enlisted under the banner of Mr. BRIGHT, cannot long remain doubtful, for it was already becoming evident that the support previously so coldly accorded Lord DERBY might be withdrawn at any moment, and without that support, it is manifestly impossible for him to retain possession of the high office to which he had been so unexpectedly called. One hope, however, yet remains to him, and that is based upon the serious controversy now pending between the UNITED STATES and England, with respect to the question of the Right of Search. If Lord DERBY can succeed in throwing upon Lord PALMERSTON the odium of the orders, under which the British squadron in the Gulf stream appears to have acted, he may so alarm the Cotton-spinners of Manchester, the iron-workers of Birmingham, and the peace party generally, as to turn the tables upon his adversaries, and in the midst of a new revulsion of popular feeling, secure to himself a renewed and more permanent lease of power.

ANNUAL CONVENTION
OF THE
PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

THURSDAY—SECOND DAY.

At the hour of 8 o'clock the Convention, with a number of the congregation, assembled at Christ church, the place of holding the same, and the communion was administered by the Bishop, aided by the Rev. Messrs. Cyrus Waters and Theodore P. Barber and the Rev. Dr. Pinkney.

MORNING SESSION.

At the appointed hour, 9 o'clock, the Convention again assembled, and was called to order by the Bishop, when morning prayers were read by the Rev. James A. Buck, at the close of which the previous day's proceedings were read.

Judge Chambers moved that the subject of the formation of a new parish out of St. Peter's Parish, Talbott county, be referred to the Committee on New Parishes, which motion prevailed.

The order of the day—the petition from clergy and laity of the Eastern Shore for a division of the Diocese—was then taken up.

H. D. Evans, Esq., was of the opinion that it would be agreeable to the Convention to know the sentiments of the Parishoners of the Eastern Shore before voting upon this proposition. He therefore offered the following:

Resolved, That the petition from the Eastern Shore, praying a division of the Diocese, be referred to a committee composed of all the members of this body, residents of the Eastern Shore, with instructions to report to the Convention how many of the clergy and how many parishes and congregations on the Eastern Shore are in favor of the division of the Diocese, and how many against the proposition.

Judge Chambers would second the resolution, as he desired fair action upon, and a proper understanding of, the subject, and he regarded this the best course to pursue, with that view.

Rev. Mr. Nelson dissented to such a proposition, as he was of the opinion that it would only result in a loss of time for the matter to have to be thus considered, and afterwards finally considered and settled by the Convention. Such a loss of time was uncalled for, as the Convention, in a body, could obtain the desired information from the clergy of that section.

Mr. I. T. Earle followed in support of the resolution. His opinion was that the Eastern Shore Parishes were not in favor of a division to the extent represented, and he wished the Conventon to act knowingly.

Rev. Mr. Dashiell desired to be informed whether all the Parishes on the Eastern Shore were notified of the intended Convention at Cambridge, from which the memorial comes, before the same was held. If they were, he did not think they should now take any exception to its action. If, after being notified to attend, they declined or neglected to do so, they had no one to blame but themselves, and could not now justly say the Convention did not express the views of the Parishioners of the Eastern Shore. He did not deem it just or fair to again open the whole question here, regarding the action of the Convention as the ultimatum upon the question, so far as the feelings of the church people of that section were concerned.

Rev. Mr. Crosdale responded that three years since, regarding such action necessary to the interests of the church, he had given notice from his pulpit that he designed to bring the matter before the Episcopal Convention. When the time came for the Convention to meet, although the subject had excited much consideration, he did not regard that it had been sufficiently canvassed, and, therefore, forbore to bring it up, but in waiving his right to do so then, he reserved the privilege to do it when he deemed the proper time had arrived.—At the last Convention he found the subject had been received with favor in Western Maryland, and several delegates from that section desired him to bring it before the Convention.

Judge Chambers.—Were they of the clergy or laity?

Mr. Crosdale.—That is not to the point, sir; I was approached by several, no matter whom. Subsequently the matter was freely talked over in his field of labor, and the feeling there found to be strongly in its favor. From other sections he had the same tidings.

The expressions from all portions of the Eastern Shore were such that he deemed the interests of the church demanded the subject would be consummated. He then, after consultation with the clergy from Worcester, Somerset and Dorchester counties, who took the initiative step, proposed a Convention of the clergy and laity of the Eastern Shore. Talbot county also desired to join in the movement, and these four counties acting together, arranged for the Convention. He had himself notified every other Parish on the Shore of the contemplated movement, and furnished them with the Committee's invitation to be present, through delegates.

Of those who assembled at Cambridge, there were thirteen of the clergy and ten laymen, while he knew of others who favored the division, who could not attend. He felt justified in saying that a large majority of the Parishes had selected delegates.—Why they did not attend he could not say.

The first thing they did was to pass resolutions expressive of their regard for their Bishop, and their regrets at being impelled, from a sense of duty, to advocate the severing of those links of affection which bound them to the Diocese. No unkind feeling was expressed or shown toward either. They were governed alone by what they believed would conduce to the Glory of God and the good of the Church, and for these they were willing to sacrifice all personal feeling.

The resolutions presented here were then introduced, and there seemed to be but one opinion in reference to them. No one offered to oppose them, and they were adopted by a vote of eleven out of the thirteen clergymen, and eight of the ten laymen; while those voting in the negative, declared themselves in favor of a division, but they doubted its practicability at this time.

He trusted that he had now given such a history of the subject as would satisfy all, that their action had been neither hasty nor unfair.

By what right, then, did gentlemen who were not present, say the proceedings were unfair, and not the work of a majority of those interested? If they allowed the matter to go by default, then there is no justification in their coming here to oppose it with such views. He defied any one to refute the assertion that two-thirds of the Eastern Shore were in favor of the division.

It was with feelings inexpressible that he advocated a motion which would sever the ties of such long standing between the Eastern and Western Shores, and nothing but God's glory and the interest of the Church would induce him so to do. It was, he said, true that the Diocese was smaller than others which had made no move for a division, but the state of the Church here and elsewhere greatly differed. In Pennsylvania the strength of the Church lies in and within a circuit of thirty miles of Philadelphia, two-thirds of their churches being within that limit, while at least two-thirds of the State had no demands upon the time of the Bishop.

This is not the case here. No, in Maryland there is no county without her Parish, and there is no State where the Church is so widely diffused. The strength of the Church in other States lies in their cities—here it is in the counties. Eighteen years ago, the Diocese deemed that the whole time of the bishop was required to superintend it. If that was the case then, how much more so is it the case now? Then the clergy numbered seventy, now they number one hundred and fifty, while the congregations have increased in a proportionate ratio. The regulations of eighteen years since, then, will not answer now.

What is the effect of the present extended state of the Diocese? All must see that the duties of the Bishop are so increased, day by day, as to place it beyond the power of any man to act as effectively as he has both the ability and will to do. During the first few years of the Episcopate the Bishop visited the Parishes of the Eastern Shore once in twelve months. Now the visits are gradually diminishing, and it is now eighteen months since he was in Somerset county, and two years since he was in Worcester. They attached no blame to the Bishop. They only wondered that, with his onerous duties, he was enabled to visit them thus often.

I ask if the church does not require a different state of things? A proportionate increase for a few years more will place it beyond the power of the Bishop to even comply with that canon which requires him to visit a Parish at least once in three years. His physical strength cannot long withstand his labors, and the whole church is affected by this state of things. All regard the visit of the Bishop as a season of great interest. His presence awakens a zeal and energy among the people, and is ever productive of much good.

The speaker then described a visit of the Bishop to his section as being only a hasty pilgrimage, or flying visits from one church to another, with scarce time for needful rest.

Entertaining these views, they called upon the Convention to heed their memorial, and grant their prayers. It is not alone demanded by the interests of the Church in one section, but throughout the State. Who will say there is not work enough in this city and the surrounding country to engage all the time of a bishop? The memorial coming as it does, representing two-thirds of the communicants of our Shore, and supported by such reasons, I cannot doubt, will meet the favor of a large proportion of this Convention, and our prayer be granted.

Mr. Evans desired to set himself and his unfortunate resolution right, as they both seemed to be misunderstood. Persons seemed to think that he was opposed to a division. That was not the case. He deemed the time had come for a division, if the thing were practicable. He wanted first, however, to be satisfied on that point, and he must confess that what had already transpired did not satisfy him. He did not believe, when he offered it, that either the friends or opponents of division would oppose his resolution, as it aimed only at obtaining a fair expression of the feelings of those interested. If it does not pass, it will be because gentlemen are afraid to submit the question to a fair test.

Rev. Dr. Cohoun thought the endorsement already given to the resolutions presented by the Cambridge Convention, by both the clergy and laity, was sufficient to entitle them to be considered at once by this Convention

The hour of eleven o'clock having arrived, and it being in order to elect the standing committee, the chair announced the same. The subject was, however, on motion, postponed, and the discussion continued.

Judge Chambers then took the floor. He opened his remarks by saying that he supposed all would agree that he had no participation in originating the resolution of Mr. Evans, but he must endorse it, as furnishing the means and basis upon which they could knowingly act.

Rev. Mr. Moore here suggested that if the gentleman would yield the floor he thought the Convention was prepared to vote, and would adopt the resolution.

Judge Chambers resuming, said, he was glad to hear that the resolution would pass, but he did not deem it as either courteous or fair for the Convention to listen to an hour's speech against it, and then attempt to dispense with anything in its favor. It is asking rather too much, and if it is asked on the score of saving time, it is asking more than an equivalent for the price offered. I would remind the gentleman that even gold can be bought with too great a price. Until I find that a majority of this Convention are in favor of having an entirely one-sided discussion, I shall not desist.

Mr. Dashiel—We did not conceive we were assuming authority in thus calling the Convention.—As teachers of religion we felt authorized as well as bound to do what we conceived would serve the interests of the Church.

Judge Chambers—I have as great respect as any man living for the high and holy calling of the gentleman, and for the mission of the clergy, but until he can show me a commission to go into conventions of this kind, I shall not yield to such an explanation. The gentleman who presented the resolutions of the Cambridge Convention (Mr. Crosdale) inquires by what right we come here to oppose them, after the question has been closed by that convention. I deny that they acted by any other than individual authority, and also that they represented the Eastern Shore in the matter. His minute history of the convention shows only that they did all in their power to carry out their individual feelings.

Now I would ask by what authority were we summoned to attend the convention at Cambridge? Who gave the clergy of the Eastern Shore authority to thus summon us? Because they asked us to meet them and consider a great question, does it follow that they can hold us responsible for their acts, when we do not deem it proper to obey their summons? In legislative bodies those chosen as representatives and failing to appear were responsible for either the good or bad there done, but such a responsibility does not exist in this case, where a body is convened to represent individual feeling or desires. Who made these gentlemen representatives of other sections of the Eastern Shore than their own?

Mr. Dashiell—Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Judge Chambers—Certainly. I am used to such things.

Mr. Dashiell—It seems to me that the gentleman is begging the question.

Judge Chambers—I have not the least doubt it seems so to the gentleman.

It is claimed that the proceedings were under authority, but I deny that they are in the least binding upon those who did not participate, and I hope the minds of members of the Convention may be released from such fallacious appeals in support of the movement, and I claim that their petition is not entitled to any more consideration than individual petitions. In regard to the facts of the case, it is important to ascertain the sentiments of the people of the Eastern Shore on this subject.

I have lived there since my birth, in the same spot. From the year 1815 I have been a member of the church, and since 1822 I have been representing my church here. My frequent and free association with the membership professionally, religiously and socially, are to be presumed as fitting me to speak of the feeling, at least, in my county, and I have yet to learn of the first man, woman or child, in Kent county, who is in favor of the proposed division.

Bishop Whittingham—There is one that I know of.

Judge Chambers—The Bishop informs me there is *one*. I accept of the correction.

Bishop—Do not understand me as saying there is only one. There may be more.

Judge Chambers—I did not say so, sir. You said there was *one*, and I only repeated your words.—For five weeks past I have been professionally engaged in Cecil county, and I there, after free access among the people, and freely talking of this matter, found but one man who favored it, and he informed me he did so in anticipation of the Bishop making Elkton his head-quarters. I have also lately been engaged professionally in Queen Anne's county, and although I have seen and talked with many of her church people, I found none there who advocates the movement.

It is true that those of the southern section of the Shore are in favor of it, because, like the Cecil man, they expect the Bishop to become a resident among them.

Mr. Barber—There is no authority for that assertion.

Judge Chambers—How can you undertake to locate the Bishop for the Eastern Shore?

Mr. Barber—You have no authority for saying we expect him to settle with us.

Judge Chambers—Have you not yet heard that it was expected that he would locate in Cambridge?

Mr. Barber—No.

Judge Chambers—Then I am wiser than you of your own town matters. I hear it all around the Shore that such is the case. The gentleman must remember the old adage—"you must go from home to hear your own news."

I do not think the people of the Eastern Shore are prepared to break those ties and bonds of unity which years have formed. My knowledge of them precludes such an impression. It has been said that the rapid increase of the Church demands a division of the Diocese. Now I claim that this very prosperity denies the policy of change in our church government, when an institution or organization increases as rapidly as we have been shown our Diocese to have increased, it is indeed a doubtful policy to think of making any alterations, and I would warn the members of the Convention to keep their hands off of so sacred a relic and landmark of prosperity. The great truths of Religion could no more change, than could the love of Him who proclaimed them; but the interests of organizations, such as this, should be touched carefully. I warn you to tread carefully upon this consecrated ground—to be cautious how you change your church regulations.

The reasons of the gentleman (Mr. Crosdale) why a change should be made, refute themselves. He details the prosperity under existing regulations, which shows the clergy to have increased, in eighteen years, from seventy to one hundred and fifty, and congregations in proportion; and yet asks to have them changed. Under such a prosperous state of things, why propose a change? Other States have divided, but I have yet to learn that any increased prosperity have followed such divisions.

It is urged that the Bishop has too much labor to perform. Now I do not think he will complain of too much labor, for I think we have the best Bishop in the world.

Bishop Whittingham—I must call you to order, as I expressed the hope, in my address, that any consideration of myself might not enter into the discussion.

Judge Chambers—I will not then offend again, but you cannot charge me with originating any reference to yourself. I will not offend again, by naming the Bishop, though I may be allowed. I hope to say that there is one Bishop who will never shrink from any duty devolving upon him, and one who is equal to all the work that this Diocese can devolve upon him. Such a man cannot be bound by a small Diocese, and there is no use to attempt to cramp him thus. Others might need a great proportion of duties to prevent idleness and consequent mischief. I am not one who would burthen our Bishop with duties. If need be, give him an assistant. I am not opposed to small Dioceses, but I do not now deem it practicable or desirable that the State should be thus divided—our organization changed, in the face of the prosperity of past years.

If the Eastern Shore is assigned a Bishop, he will have to be provided for, and I have yet to learn that the Cambridge Convention has made any such provision, or even considered this question. During the past eighteen years that section of the State has subscribed but $6,000 to the permanent fund for the support of a Bishop. This certainly does not give much assurance that it will give a desirable and respectable support to an Episcopate.

Our Diocese contains fifteen thousand nine hundred and fifty-nine square miles. We are told this is too large a territory for one Bishop to have the charge of. Why, if an Eastern Shore Bishop was going to visit his own Diocese, he would as a matter of convenience come over to the other Diocese, and then take the route so dolefully described as a pilgrimage calculated to physically exhaust him.

The Virginia Diocese contains sixty-one thousand, three hundred and fifty-two square miles, and yet they do not propose a division. There is another consideration, Mr. President, in this connection. I would, in the first place, regret to see the bench of bishops increased to any very great extent, and if the precedent is established, of allowing a bishop to every 7,000 square miles of territory, what would that body in a short time amount to. I have not as implicit faith in such large bodies, as in small select ones. Again, would the bench of bishops consent to our doubling our representation there, when Maryland is among the smallest of the Dioceses.

Unfortunately there has sprung up in our country strong political anti-relations. It has so gone abroad and the political cauldron so boiled and bubbled, that the fingers of Maryland had, too, been scorched. Now while we are grateful, as a church, at possessing the influence of cementing our whole State by her teachings in one great cause, shall we consent to throw her into the boiling cauldron which has created such heart-burnings? Is this the time to sever the bonds which so bind us together? Let us pause and reflect well upon the result before we act.

The churchmen and laymen of our State have of late evidenced an unusual zeal in the interests of the church, and it is proposed that the work shall be startled and not only retarded, but crippled by the severance of the bonds uniting the two Shores. There is nothing so demanding such a change as to justify the risk that the act carries with it.

Mr. Brice Goldsborough conceived that the discussion had taken too wide a range; the merits of the whole question having been gone into upon a resolution to refer the matter to a committee. He did not deem the issue upon this resolution as settling the question, which is an interesting one to the Eastern Shore. After the clergy had shown the spiritual wants of that section, it would have been time enough for the laymen to come forward in the discussion, and also to state how far they would be prepared to support an Episcopate. Though in favor of the division, if he could be convinced that a majority of the churchmen on the Eastern Shore were opposed to it, he would stamp the movement under foot by a vote of disapprobation. He was, in part, in favor of the resolution, but would like to see it modified by having the subject referred to a committee of three.

Rev. Mr. Nelson hoped that it might be so further amended that the roll of the clergy and the laity of the Eastern Shore be called at once upon this subject. If they are opposed to the division, he for one would never urge it. He concluded by offering a resolution to that effect.

Mr. Evans—I gladly accept the amendment.

Mr. Goldsborough—And I too.

Judge Chambers hoped the gentleman from Baltimore, (Mr. Evans,) would reflect before adopting it, as there was now a number of laymen present who could vote the wishes of their Parishoners.

Rev. Dr. Kerfoot offered a substitute, declaring it expedient that the Diocese of Maryland be divided. If it was adopted, he said, the Convention could then select a Committee to report the line of division, &c., at the next Convention; but if rejected, the whole question would be disposed of. When he came here he was of the opinion that the Eastern Shore was united upon the question. He found they were not, and he hoped the Convention might be better informed thereon, before a decisive vote is had.

Rev. Mr. Crosdale considered the proposition of Rev. Dr. Kerfoot as calculated to crush out the whole question, and not directly or respectfully answering the memorialists.

Mr. F. W. Brune deprecated the adoption of the substitute, as it would call upon the Convention to vote directly upon the question of division. He had no doubt many were prepared to vote now, but there were those who were not prepared. He did not regard the question as being simply—Shall the Eastern Shore have a Diocese? It comprised only one-third of the present one, and, in all probability, should a division even be declared, other metes and bounds than the dividing line between the two shores might be adopted.

Rev. Dr. Kerfoot then withdrew his resolution until a vote had been taken upon the proposition of the Rev. Mr. Nelson, but reserving the right to afterwards renew it in a modified form.

The resolution of the Rev. Mr. Nelson was then adopted.

The roll of lay delegates for the Eastern Shore was then called, and they were desired to answer as to the wishes of their several Parishes, with the following result:

For the Division—Messrs. Dashiell, Dennis, B. J. Goldsborough, M. T. Goldsborough, Hayward, Holliday, Johnston, Ryall and Dougherty—9.

Against the Division—Messrs. Chambers, Beck, I. T. Earle, Geo. Earle, Kennard, Massey, Veazey and Matthews—8.

The clergy of the same section were then called, and answered as follows:

YEAS—Rev. Messrs. Barber, Crosdale, E. F. Dashiel, Gould, Mason, Moore, Spencer, Stewart, White, Curtis, Parkman, Clarke and Bryan—13.

NAYS—Rev. Messrs. Atkinson, Knight, Stokes, Berry and Bevan—4.

Rev. Dr. Kerfoot then offered a resolution that the whole subject be referred to a committee of nine of the clergy and laity, who shall report to the next Convention, and that they be instructed to ascertain the wishes of all the clergy, Parishes and congregations in the Diocese, and if then found desirable to report lines of division to the next Convention.

Judge Chambers would submit whether there had not already been a sufficient expression of feeling upon which to predicate a direct vote upon the subject of division.

Rev. Dr. Kerfoot had altered his resolution because he did not consider the Convention was prepared to vote.

Rev. Mr. Nelson did not think it would be treating the memorialists with respect to vote upon any but the direct question. He believed the Convention fully prepared to vote. He came here prepared to vote for it, thinking the Eastern Shore was a unit upon it, or nearly so, but now that he found eight Parishes against it he would vote nay, and had no doubt a majority of the Convention would be with him.

Rev. Dr. Kerfoot was in the same position, but he thought it would be treating the memorialists better to refer it as he proposed, and not to act hastily in the premises.

Mr. Maynadier called the previous question upon the motion of Rev. Dr. Kerfoot, which call was sustained, and the motion adopted by a vote of yeas 90, nays 51.

The Chair announced another order of the day—the electing of the Standing Committee.

Judge Chambers nominated Rev. Dr. Cox for that position, and in so doing stated that the Diocese owed him a debt of gratitude for his services in arresting a movement fraught with great danger to the Bible, by alterations of its texts by the Bible Society.

The election was then proceeded with, and resulted in the selection of the Rev. Wm. E. Wyatt, D. D., the Rev. Joseph Spencer, D. D., the Rev. Jas. A. McKenney, D. D., the Rev. Wm. Pinkney, D. D., the Rev. John Crosdale, the Rev. Samuel K. Stewart, and the Rev. Dr. A. C. Cox, D. D.

The Convention then adjourned until 5 o'clock.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Convention re-assembled at 5 o'clock, and was called to order by the Bishop.

On motion of the Rev. Dr. Allen, the chair appointed as a committee of three to nominate the various committees under the canon for the extension of the church, the Rev. Drs. Wyatt and Allen, and and Wm. W. Johnson, Esq.

Mr. H. D. Evans, from the Committee on New Parishes reported an act for the establishment of the Southern St. Peter's Parish, Talbot county.

The Bishop suggested that the name had better be changed as two Parishes in the same county of the same, or almost the same name, would result in working much confusion, and suggested that it be referred back to the committee for amendment. The suggestion was approved, and the committee then reported it under the name of White Marble Parish, when the act was adopted. He also reported an act for the establishing of Deer Creek Parish, Harford county, which was adopted.

Judge Chambers, from a Committee appointed at the previous Convention to report upon the subject of requiring lay delegates to be communicants, submitted a report adverse to the changing of the Constitution in this particular.

Mr. Evans offered a substitute providing for such change, when, on motion of Judge Chambers, the whole question was tabled.

Mr. Evans, from a committee to whom was referred the donation of Miss Goldsborough, reported a resolution to provide for the annual appointment of three trustees to take charge thereof, and naming Messrs. Geo. Goldsborough, Thos. Hayward and Wm. H. Groome for such duties. The report was adopted.

He also reported an act for the re-adjustments of the metes and bounds of the church of the Epiphany, Washington, which was adopted.

The Rev. Dr. Wyatt, of the Standing Committee, here announced the following nominations for the several regular Committees:

Ecclesiastical Court.—The Rev. John R. Keech, the Rev. Orlando Hutton, the Rev. H. T. Harrison, the Rev. Ethan Allen, D. D., the Rev. Alex. M. Marbury, M. D., the Rev. T. P. Barber, and the Rev. Libertus Van Bokkelen.

Missions Committee—in charge also of Disabled and Superannuated Clergy Fund.—The Rev. J. H. Morrison, the Rev. A. C. Coxe, and the Rev. L. Van Bokkelen; and Messrs. J. Mason Campbell, Hugh D. Evans, LL. D., Charles Gilman, G. Somerville Norris, Alexander Randall, and J. H. Alexander.

Bible and Prayer Book Committee.—The Rev. Geo. A. Leakin, the Rev. Hugh T. Harrison, D. D., and the Rev. H. V. D. Johns, D. D.; and Messrs. F. Donaldson, M. D., M. H. Howe, J. Snyder, L. Thomsen, William Woodward, and R. C. Wysham.

Book and Tract Committee.—The Rev. W. E. Wyatt, D. D., the Rev. J. A. McKenney, D. D., and the Rev. W. Pinkney, D. D.; and Messrs. F. W. Brune, Jr., Wm. G. Harrison, Richard Kemp, R. M. Proud, J. Schaaff Stocket and G. W. Tinges.

Education Committee:—The Rev. C. K. Nelson, the Rev. C. W. Rankin, and the Rev. J. N. McJilton; and Messrs. T. S. Alexander, Samuel Chew, M. D., E. S. Courtney, George W. Dobbin, H. Penn, M. D., and J. G. Proud, Jr.

The Chair here appointed as the Committee to consider the proposition to divide the Diocese: The Revs. Dr. Kerfoot, Jno. Crosdale, Dr. Allen, Dr. Pyne, and Messrs. E. F. Chambers, Brice J. Goldsborough, Wm. B. Stone, E. S. Childs, and J. Mason Campbell.

The Committee on Accounts, through Judge Williams, reported that they had found the reports of the Treasurer of the Pastoral Aid Fund and Diocesan Missions all correct.

The Convention then adjourned to 9 o'clock this morning.

ELECTION RETURNS.

CECIL COUNTY.

	FOR CONVENTION.	AGAINST CONVENTION.
1st District	16 maj.	— maj.
2d "	—	9
3d "	—	88 "
4th "	—	190 "
5th "	62 "	—
7th "	18 "	—

KENT COUNTY.

This county, we learn, has given 12 majority against a Convention.

CARROLL COUNTY.

	FOR CONVENTION.	AGAINST CONVENTION.
Finksburg	—	60 maj.
Westminster	139 maj.	296 "

FREDERICK COUNTY.

	FOR CONVENTION.	AGAINST CONVENTION.
Frederick	—	240 maj.
New Market District	—	43 "
Middletown (reported)	8	—

BALTIMORE COUNTY.

	FOR CONVENTION.	AGAINST CONVENTION.
3d District	40	139
5th "	1	150
6th "	12	146
8th "	97	158