

Therefore, in the best interests of the temperance cause, he felt it incumbent upon him to bring up the amendment.

Mr. Richardson was not in favor of prohibition for three reasons. In the first place, it was not scriptural; in the second place, it stirred up extreme feelings in prohibitionists against those who were not prohibitionists; and in the third place he knew of a better system. He briefly outlined the system adopted in the liquor traffic by the government of Norway and which had been attended by excellent results.

Dean O'Meara also thought the Synod would be unwise in committing itself to prohibition. The institution of prohibition would not prohibit. Liquors would be procured somehow, and the people would become law-breakers and liars. He did not believe in placing too much reliance on machinery. He would support Rev. Silva White's amendment.

Mr. Mulock spoke at some length in the defence of his motion. He condemned the Norwegian system, pointing out its evil effects on the homes of drinkers, even if it benefited the drinkers themselves somewhat.

Mr. Thos. Robinson, on the contrary, favored the system, and said that it was recommended by the Bishop of Chester, one of the best known temperance advocates in England.

Mr. Roy said that as long as there was a demand for liquor there would be a supply. If the demand ceased, the supply would naturally cease.

Mr. W. D. Harper, an Indian from St. Peter's mission, was in favor of Mr. Mulock's motion, and expressed a hope that the Synod would arrive at some unanimous opinion.

For his part he knew of 119 men in his reserve who were prohibitionists, and it was owing to the splendid work of their pastor, Rev. Mr. Anderson, that they were so.

Mr. H. M. Howell expressed great pleasure at hearing the remarks made by Mr. Harper. He had never heard a speech which had affected him more. But the drinking of liquor was voluntary. It produced about \$10,000,000 a year revenue, and was one of the chief supports of the government. Political economists refer to it as one of the best voluntary revenues.

After some further discussion, His Grace put the question to a vote, when the amendment carried by a vote of 46 to 10.

It being then almost 6 o'clock, the Synod adjourned after His Grace had pronounced the benediction.

THIRD DAY.

The Synod met again at 10 o'clock on Saturday morning. After the usual prayer the business of the day was commenced by Mr. Mulock, who made a motion advocating the use of unfermented wine in the Holy Communion. The motion was seconded by J. M. Johnston, and considerable discussion followed.

Rev. J. J. Roy spoke on the subject. He thought the chief difficulty was in getting genuine wine, i.e., fruit of the grape.

His Grace discountenanced discussion on the subject. He did not think it was within the province of the Synod to pass any motion on so serious a matter. Some of the highest church authorities in England had expressed their opin-

ion in favor of the ordinary wine, not being able to find scriptural evidence in favor of the unfermented variety. Care should, of course, be taken to get the very best wine procurable. The Primate did not wish to have the discussion forced upon the Synod, as he did not think the matter came within their jurisdiction.

Mr. Johnston, the seconder, said that he had seconded the motion, not for the purpose of forcing a discussion upon the house, but simply to gain information on the subject.

Rev. Mr. Roy read the decision of the Upper House in the convocations of Canterbury, July, 1883:—

"This house is of the opinion that agitation of any question on so sacred a subject is much to be deprecated as tending to distress many religious persons, to unsettle the weak, and even to lead to schism; that it is quite unnecessary to raise the question referred to in the gravamen, inasmuch as the Church, though always insisting on the use of wine in Holy Communion, has never prescribed the strength or weakness of the wine to be used, and consequently it is always possible to deal with even extreme cases without departing from the custom observed by the Church, and that it is therefore most convenient that the clergy should conform to ancient and unbroken usage, and should discountenance all attempts to deviate from it."

In view of His Grace's opinion on the matter, Mr. Mulock withdrew his motion.

Mr. Mulock, seconded by Mr. Johnston, then made, the following motion:—

Resolved, That, in view of the fact that the Dominion government has decided to adopt the plebiscite for the purpose of ascertaining the will of the people of Canada on the question of totally prohibiting the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors within the Dominion, this Synod believing that in the event of the proposed plebiscite resulting favorably, a law based thereon and duly enforced must greatly reduce the evils referred to, would urge the members of the Church of this Diocese to give all possible support in favor of this plebiscite, and, if the same is carried, in support of the due enforcement of the law.

The opinion generally expressed was that the motion of Mr. Mulock was practically the same as the one moved by him on Friday, and as the motion had been fairly quashed, it was deemed unnecessary to discuss the present one.

The Very Rev. Dean O'Meara, seconded by Rev. C. R. Littler, then moved an amendment, That while this Synod considered it advisable that the opinion of the Dominion electors should be sought by a plebiscite as to the advisability of prohibition; and while further, if, as a result of the plebiscite, prohibition legislation should be enacted, this Synod would urge all Churchmen to a cordial and loyal support of the law, yet this Synod does not see it to be advisable to pronounce in advance any opinion on the subject to be submitted to the judgment of the electorate.

Before a vote was taken, His Grace expressed himself briefly on the subject. He said that while the scriptures condemn the vice of drunkenness, yet they considered wine as the good gift of God and as the emblem of joy. His