

Brockville (additional), per Rev. Dr. Lewis.....	1 5 0
Rawdon.....	0 7 0
Nesbitt Reids.....	0 2 0
Hungerford.....	0 2 6
Cook Settlement.....	0 0 9

Per Rev. F. J. S. Groves.....	0 12 3
Norway, per Churchwarden.....	1 9 11
Port Burwell.....	0 10 0
Vicars.....	0 16 0

Per Rev. H. B. Jessopp.....	1 5 0
-----------------------------	-------

133 Collections, amounting to....£200 11 10

GENERAL PURPOSES.

Previously announced.....	£253 9 8
Louth.....	0 11 3
Goulburne and Huntley.....	0 17 11
St. George's, Puslinch.....	0 13 9
St. Phillip's, Markham.....	0 8 0
Grace Church, do.....	0 7 0

Per Rev. G. S. Hill.....	0 15 0
St. Peter's, Concession, per Rev. H. E. Pless.....	0 13 6
Port Burwell.....	0 10 0
Vienna, per Rev. H. B. Jessopp.....	0 16 0

1 5 0

157 Collections, amounting to....£258 6 1

MISSION FUND.

Previously announced.....	£294 13 9
St. James', Kingston, per Rev. R. V. Rogers.....	1 2 0
St. John's, Murray, per Rev. H. E. Pless.....	0 12 2
St. John's, Prescott.....	6 11 9
St. James', Maitland.....	1 0 0

7 11 9

182 Collections, amounting to....£304 0 2

PAROCHIAL BRANCHES.

St. Paul's, Cavan, (additional).....	0 5 0
St. Mary's, Manvers.....	5 0 0
Cobourg, 1/2.....	27 15 0
Do. Special Mission Fund.....	1 5 0
Darlington, 1/2.....	5 0 0
Cartwright, 1/2.....	3 15 0
Grafton, 1/2.....	3 7 6
Colbourne.....	5 13 4

Per Ven. A. N. Bethune.....	46 15 10
St. James', Toronto.....	39 11 3
St. John's, London Township, special W. & O.....	1 3 2
Markham, 1/2, per Rev. H. C. Cooper.....	3 5 2
Collingwood.....	7 4 8
Creemore.....	3 8 6

Per Rev. J. Langtry.....	10 8 2
Emily, per Rev. R. Harding.....	3 9 1
Streetsville.....	8 10 0
Brockville, per Rev. Dr. Lewis.....	10 0 1
York Mills.....	7 10 5
Fitzroy and Pakenham.....	4 14 2
Brock, 12 Con. (donation).....	1 0 0
Port Burwell.....	2 10 0

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS.

Rev. J. Padfield.....	1 5 0
Rev. G. S. J. Hill.....	1 5 0
Rev. T. S. Kennedy.....	1 5 0

Mrs. Kennedy, Bath, England, W. and O. Fund.....	1 0 0
Mrs. Parke, do. do. do.....	1 0 0
Rev. H. E. Pless.....	1 5 0
Rev. E. Morgan.....	2 10 0
Rev. R. J. MacGeorge.....	1 5 0
Rev. H. Cooper.....	1 5 0
Rev. H. Mulkins, in arrears.....	7 10 0

ELECTION OF A BISHOP!

CHURCH OF ENGLAND SYNOD!

The Western Division of the Church of England Diocese of Toronto having recently been erected in a separate Bishopric, the clergy and laity of the new Diocese assembled on Wednesday, July 8th, at London, for the purpose of electing a Bishop.

The proceedings commenced, at 11 A.M., with Divine service, in St. Paul's Church, when a sermon suitable to the occasion was preached by the Rev. Mr. Holland, of Tyrconnell, from Acts 1st. chapter 24th and 25th verses, which have reference to the selection of an Apostle in the room of the Apostle Judas. The words of the text were these:—

"23. And they appointed two, Joseph, called Barnabas, who was surnamed Justus, and Matthias.

"24. And they prayed, and said Thou, Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men, show whether of these two thou hast chosen.

"25. That he may take part of this ministry and apostleship, from which Judas by transgression fell that he might go to his own place.

"26. And they gave fourth their lots; and the lot fell upon Matthias; and he was numbered with the eleven apostles."

After which the Holy Communion was administered to the Clerical and Lay Delegates. The Bishop of Toronto then suggested that the certificates of Lay Delegates be examined, and the names of the Clergy entitled to vote, and correct lists be prepared by 4 p.m., at which time the Synod would assemble. His Lordship nominated Messrs. Evans, Boomer, Dewar, and Sedgwick from among the Clergy, and Messrs. E. Deedes, W. W. Street, Thomas Shortt, and Major Donaldson, from among the Laity, to prepare a correct list of persons entitled to vote. The three Secretaries, Rev. J. G. Geddes, T. S. Kennedy, and Dr. Bovell, of the General Synod, to assist with their advice.

The Synod re-assembled at 4 P.M.—the Bishop of Toronto presiding. Prayers were read by the Rev. H. J. Grassett. The galleries, and that portion of the body of the church not occupied by the delegates, gave accommodation to a considerable number of interested spectators. The clergy of the district, and, with very few exceptions, the lay delegates appointed by the several congregations, answered their names.

The BISHOP then addressed the Synod, as follows—Rev. Gentlemen, and Gentlemen, I feel it my duty on this most auspicious occasion, to commence by offering the laity of this proposed diocese my heart thanks for the generous liberality with which they have come forward to establish an Episcopal endowment. Until this primary object was in a great measure effected, you could not make any substantial progress towards the subdivision of the vast diocese of Toronto; for the Government very wisely required to be satisfied that a reasonable provision should be made for endowment before giving their assent to any division, and before the Governor General signified his readiness to recommend the appointment by her Majesty of such person as the Bishop of Toronto, and church authorities should approve of. Taking these requirements into consideration, it has been thought

that the most satisfactory course would be to submit the choice of the new Bishop to the clergy and laity of the church residing within the limits of the district which was to constitute the diocese, convened in Synod under the present Bishop. Not doubting that the Synod so constituted would at the same time assume the pledge to make good the small deficiency in the Episcopal endowment given by the stipendation which reported the sum already assured for that purpose, and the steps adopted to raise in a reasonable time, to the maximum contemplated in my pastoral letter, of January, 1854.

The path of progress being thus graciously opened by Her Majesty the Queen, through Her representative Sir Edmund Head, Baronet, it was further smoothed and prepared by the wise proceedings of our late Synod. Among other things it settled the mode of election, for it was observed that it would be most unfortunate, if at the first meeting of the primary and imperfect Synod, it should be called upon to discharge the difficult and exciting duty of determining the manner in which the election of its Bishop should be made and carried out. Such a course appeared to me so very objectionable that I thought myself bound to protest against it, and to express my disapprobation to preside unless a question so vitally important was disposed of by the general Synod. This was also found to be the feeling of a great majority, and it was accordingly resolved that "The clergy and laity shall vote separately by ballot, the clergy by individuals and the laity by parishes. A majority of votes in each order shall determine the choice, provided that two-thirds of the clergy entitled to vote be present, and two-thirds of all the parishes entitled to vote be represented; otherwise two-thirds of the votes of each order shall be necessary to determine the choice."

This comprehensive and yet simple method of election is adopted literally, or in substance by several of the Dioceses of the United States, and seemed to work very pleasantly.

All things being now in order, we meet this day under a regular call to make choice of a fit person to become the Bishop of the New Diocese. But as we are yet without practice in such matters, a few remarks derived in a great measure from the experience of our sister church, may not, on this occasion, be unreasonable. 1st, all who are entitled to vote at this meeting should bear in mind that they come unfettered as to place or person. They may vote or not vote as they feel inclined. They may select their candidate from any Diocese or branch of the United Church of England and Ireland; for no other restriction is imposed and the choice is left to the unbiased consciences of the electors. 2nd, should the first ballot not decide, a second or even more may be found expedient. 3rd, in cases where the candidates are few in number, and the clerical vote prevails more than once, it is commonly found that the laity in deference, give way, and seldom claim a third ballot. Having maintained their privilege by using it once, and more than maintained it by voting twice, they are content, for the sake of peace and unanimity to join their clerical brethren. Moreover, at such a time, the laity feel that to continue voting would indicate something like unreasonable pertinacity, because the clergy have not only a nearer personal interest in the Bishop, but they must have frequent intercourse with him for advice and direction, and it may be justly said without offence that they are in general more accurate judges of his qualifications, hence, from these and other reasons which might be mentioned, they have a claim in such cases to some indulgence from the lay brethren. 4th, when the candidates are numerous, it may sometimes be necessary to have