

the clerical and lay delegates from the District which is thus to be placed under especial episcopal supervision, would have a voice and vote in electing the man who should have authority over them in the Lord; and both for expedition, and convenience, and efficiency, it would really seem that this may be the easiest solution of our difficulty, and the course most likely to result in the immediate extension and permanent establishment of the Church.

In proposing such an arrangement, it would be well also to consider whether the limits of this Missionary Diocese might not be advantageously extended, and whether it could not prove conducive to all the interests involved if Muskoka were added to Algoma. At present, Muskoka belongs to the Diocese of Toronto, equally with Algoma; whilst its need of missionary exertion is no less urgent and binding. As a new district of country, it is rapidly opening up; and whether or not, it is destined to realize the flattering promises of the Government in inaugurating its Free Land Grant policy, or the still more sanguine hopes excited by emigration agents, Muskoka is undoubtedly an immense district, with a growing population, and with increasing facilities for trade, and for missions. It covers an area of 3,396,887 acres of land, a large portion of which is valuable for its mineral resources, and is highly favorable for agricultural pursuits. In 1861, there was the small population of 320, whereas this had increased in 1871, according to the Census Returns, to 6,919. The religious element is fairly represented; and our own Church notably among the different denominations. There are Roman Catholics, Methodists, Presbyterians, and other religious bodies, returning in the whole little more than 4000 members, whilst the membership of the Church of England alone amounts to over 2000. Here is the beginning of a great work; here is the nucleus of a most successful Mission. Why, then, may not the two Missions of Algoma and Muskoka be joined together as one Bishopric, supported from one fund, and subject to one control? The distance between the two districts is not insurmountable, while the advantage of direct episcopal supervision would be great. It is not an arrangement which should be made permanent, as each district is sufficiently large to form an independent See, and in due time two bishops must occupy the territory between them. But as preliminary to this, the proposal I have made is not without its points of recommendation; and whether the arrangement be left with the Toronto, or to the Provincial Synod, I respectfully submit that the union I have suggested is not unworthy of consideration.

I am compelled to touch again on the question of money. Our principal difficulty lies there; and yet I cannot for the life of me see that there need be any difficulty at all. It will undoubtedly require a large amount of money to begin, and to carry on this enterprise efficiently; and it is undeniably certain that the whole, or, at any rate, a large proportion of the required sum might have been raised by this time, if we had gone about the thing in the right way. The question of endowment has been too lightly thought of all the way through. Is it not incomprehensible that not a single word was said about this matter at the Provincial Synod? and is it not lamentable to think that the whole year has been allowed to pass away without a fund having been started? Fancy a Synod electing a Missionary Bishop without the "provision" of *a single cent* much less "an adequate provision"—for carrying on his work. And fancy the whole Church burning with zeal on this subject,