

1887, being the anniversary of the consecration of the first Colonial Bishop. An earnest effort should be made to secure the presence at this commemoration of the following:—(a) As many as possible of the Bishops of B. N. America. (b) A delegation from this Provincial Synod. (c) A delegation from the General Convention of the Church in the United States. (d) A delegation from each Diocesan Synod of Canada.

Third—The central commemoration should be conducted as follows:—There shall be (a) a special service of thanksgiving in one or more of the churches in Halifax on August 12; (b) a commemoration sermon or sermons by a selected preacher or preachers on that day or the Sunday following; (c) a public meeting, with addresses by selected speakers.

Fourth—The Archbishops of England and Ireland, and the Primus of the Church of Scotland, and the Venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel shall be requested to make such arrangements as may be practicable for a simultaneous commemoration in England and throughout the British Empire.

Fifth—The Clergy throughout the Dominion shall be requested to hold a special commemoration service of thanksgiving on the last Sunday in July, 1887, and at such service to give instructions to their congregations with respect to the history and progress of the Colonial Church. The offerings at such services, as well as at the central commemoration in Halifax, should be given towards the erection of a Memorial Cathedral in the City of Halifax, the See of the first Colonial Bishop. It is recommended that all such offerings be remitted to Halifax previous to the celebration of August 12th.

Sixth—That a Joint Committee be appointed by this Synod to advise and co-operate with the Local Committee at Halifax.

(Signed,)

JOHN FREDERICTON,
Chairman.

The report was adopted.

MISSIONARY BROTHERHOODS.

The motion of the Rev. Mr. Davenport was then taken up, and he moved, seconded by Rev. J. W. Burke:—

"That whereas it has been shown by members both of the Upper and Lower Houses of this Province that great difficulties exist in securing sufficient funds and men for missionary enterprise in new fields of labor; and whereas it has been proved by the past experience of the Church that the most efficacious, fruitful and economical method of bringing under cultivation new fields of labor is by Missionary Brotherhoods; and whereas such organizations call forth in an especial manner that Christian enthusiasm for which our Bishops often plead. Resolved, that this Provincial Synod encourage by all means in its power the formation of such Missionary Brotherhoods for the pioneer work of the Church of England in Canada."

The debate upon this question occupied the attention of the House until nearly midnight, a large number of the members participating in it. At times the discussion waxed warm, and towards the end became rather excited and noisy owing chiefly to the unwise and partizan action of a few members sitting near the platform. There seemed to be a desire on the part of some to treat the matter in a narrow, party light; others, by an attempt at witicism, endeavored to ridicule the proposal; others again persisted in seeing in the modestly worded resolution a movement towards the introduction of monastic institutions—characterized by several as abominations; whilst others evidently had taken fright at the use of the term "brotherhoods," and could not be satisfied with the proposal to substitute, instead of "Missionary Brotherhoods," "missionaries living in community."

The supporters of the motion seemed willing to adopt the suggested amendments, and earnestly pleaded for the need in the missionary work of the Church of men, untrammelled by family ties, living together in Mission houses and working from one centre, of ardent burning Christian love and zeal, and who denying themselves the comforts of home and continuing unmarried, at least for a certain number of years, might in the spirit of the Master more effectively carry on his work in these sections of the country where married men could not go, or where missionaries with families and living independently could not be maintained for want of sufficient funds. Amongst the most able and earnest advocates (other than the mover) of the principle involved in the resolution—though not binding themselves to the wording thereof—were the Rev. F. R. Murray, of Halifax; the Rev. G. C. Mackenzie, of Brantford; Rev. Dr. Mockridge, of Hamilton; Rev. Dr. Carry, of Port Perry; Archdeacon Lindsay, of Waterloo, and Rev. A. C. Nesbitt. After the discussion had proceeded for some time it was moved in amendment by the Rev. Mr. Cayley, and seconded by Rev. G. C. Mackenzie: "That this Synod is of opinion that very valuable pioneer work can be done in the Church of England by missionary clergymen associated in Missionary houses, under such circumstances as may be approved of by the Bishop of the diocese," the intention being apparently to meet the fears entertained by some that vows of celibacy were contemplated; but later this amendment was withdrawn in favor of one moved by Rev. W. B. Carey, replacing the words *Missionary Brotherhoods* in the original resolution, by *missionaries living in communities—and such organizations* by "Missionaries living in community or Mission houses," and changing the latter portion of the resolution to read: Resolved that this Provincial Synod encourage by all means in its power the promotion of such Mission houses in which missionary clergy shall be associated, but under no other vows than their ordination vows for the pioneer work of the Church of England in Canada." After the discussion had been continued on this amendment, it was moved to refer the matter to a committee to report at next session; but this amendment was lost; and on that of Mr. Carey being taken up, a misunderstanding arose through a change in the wording of the latter part of the amendment to meet the supposed wishes of members of the house, and which gave rise to unfortunate charges of attempting to deceive, &c., and created such excitement that the Prolocutor was obliged to interfere and suggested the withdrawal of the whole matter, and S. Bethune, Q.C., one of the assessors having also urged this course the whole matter was dropped. The House then adjourned until Wednesday at 10 a.m.

SEVENTH AND LAST DAY.

After the usual routine business the following were appointed as the delegation from the Synod to attend the Centennial Celebration of the Colonial Episcopate in Halifax, commencing the third Sunday in June, 1887, instead of July, [according to the change in date made by message from the Upper House]: The Prolocutor, Rev. Dr. Bethune, Rev. Dr. Roe, Rev. Canon Medley, Dean Carmichael, Rev. Canon Innes, Archdeacon McMurray, Archdeacon Jones, Chancellor Heneker, Hon. G. W. Allan, H. W. Frith, Chancellor Bethune, R. Bayley, Hon. G. A. Kirkpatrick and Hon. Senator Plumb.

The committee on religious education in Public Schools reported recommending that the resolution passed by the House be communicated to the various religious bodies, and that a committee be appointed in each diocese to act in the matter.

It was also decided to appoint a committee to make enquiries and report at next session as to the possibility of obtaining an official report of the proceedings of Synod.

It was also resolved to appoint a committee to enquire how the work of the Church amongst the French population can best be carried on; also one to consider the propriety of the adoption by this Provincial Synod of a Canon similar to the statute (No. 5) of the Church of the Province of New Zealand, or Chapter IV. of the Constitution of the Church of Ireland, with regard to the appointment to cures and parishes.

SACRAMENTAL WINE.

The Rev. Dr. Carry then moved, seconded by Mr. Geo. Elliott: "That whereas, of late years, in different quarters, and under various pleas, other liquids than wine have been employed in the Sacrament of the Holy Communion, and the lawfulness of wine, as usually understood, denied for the same, thereby affecting the reality of the Sacrament, and greatly endangering the peace of the Church, this Provincial Synod feels bound to express its strongest disapprobation of such unauthorized acts, and does hereby admonish the clergy of this Ecclesiastical Province to make no innovation in so sacred a matter as the elements divinely ordained in this Holy Sacrament, and so adhere faithfully to the custom and tradition of the Catholic Church in the same."—(See pages 23 and 203, Journal of 1883.) The mover in the course of an exceedingly able and practical address claimed that the use of the so-called *unfermented wine* was not only contrary to the practice of the Church of England, but in violation of Catholic usage and doctrine, and in direct conflict with the teaching of the most learned Divines and Commentators as to the nature of the wine used by our Lord in instituting this Holy Ordinance; he denounced the terrible language used by some touching the use of fermented wine in the Holy Communion, e.g. "cup of devils," and pointed out the evils arising from attempting to set aside in this matter the practice and teaching of the Catholic Church for eighteen hundred years—which practice and usage ought in itself to be conclusive. He denied that there was any real difference of opinion amongst the ablest scholars and leading theologians of all schools on the subject. He referred to the decision of the Upper House of the Province of Canterbury condemning the "unfermented wine" theory; and strongly urged the Synod, representing the Church in Canada, to give no uncertain decision, in order to at once arrest the threatened mischief consequent upon the action of mistaken though zealous people; and prevent further difficulties. Referring to the pretension that men were prevented from coming to Holy Communion through the use of wine, properly so called, he expressed doubt as to its truth, but if true, the only remedy for those who, it was claimed, were affected in this way was to refrain from the Communion until, by the grace of God, they could resist temptation. He did not believe in making the weakness of the sinful the law for the faithful.

The Rev. Dr. Carry was followed by the Rev. Dr. Stone, of St. Martin's Church, Montreal, who in eloquent and forcible terms met the objection advanced by some that our Lord could not and did not use fermented wine in instituting this Holy Sacrament; and pointed out the want of faith in Him and disobedience to His command involved in the use of any other element than that ordained by Christ Himself. They had no right to change what His wisdom had ordained. What might happen in an individual case was not before them at all, as the Lord must have had such cases in his mind and yet ordained the sacrament. If they changed the element of wine to anything else, he maintained there would be no sacrament at all.

Mr. Geo. Elliott, of Guelph, the seconder of the resolution, held there was no such a thing as *unfermented wine*; as wine, according to all authority, was the fermented juice of the grape. He held that it was monstrous to suppose that the use of wine in the Communion should be the cause of sin. The faith of the Church would