

man should be selected for the purpose, and ample time given, in which he might prepare an address worthy of the occasion.

It seems to me to be utterly unworthy of an educational institution of any pretensions to fritter away an evening in self gratulations over some temporary triumph, and irrelevant speeches, while the great field of education and principles of instruction are ignored. A convocation is supposed to be an assembly of the most learned of the community, and all the details of such an assembly should be carried out on that assumption.

Were this done I am convinced these convocations would be far more interesting to educated men, and more profitable for the College.

JACOBUS.

16th Oct. 1889.

### DEGREES IN DIVINITY.

SIR,—It is greatly to be regretted that the Synod was unwilling to allow any discussion into the details of the Canon on Divinity Degrees. Provost Body seems to be under the impression that any errors or omissions can be amended when the Canon comes up for Confirmation at the next Synod, but I am afraid that he will find himself mistaken. At all events when I endeavored to adopt a like procedure the Synod before last, I was ruled out of order by the present Prolocutor, and in this I believe he was supported by the late Speaker of the House of Commons, so that one may consider the question as finally decided, although I must confess that I still adhere to my original opinion. It is not my intention to offer any verbal criticisms on the Canon in question. My opposition to the Canon is founded on the belief that, as drawn, it will not have the effect of carrying out the object that the framers had in view viz: to prevent the lowering of the Standard of the Degree of D.D., and at the same time to suggest a practical solution of the vexed question relating to Text Books. With respect to the Degree it seems to me that the Canon in question must infallibly result in a lowering of the standard by the proposed curriculum. In the first place Hebrew is not made obligatory at all, a d, for 10 years at all events, only such a smattering of Latin and Greek as is necessary for passing a Matriculation Examination. Now this might be well enough for any ordinary degree, but when we consider that the Degree of Doctor in Divinity is or ought to be the highest degree that can be awarded by an University, and is intended to impress upon the outside world that the bearer of such Degree is fully grounded in all matters connected with Theology, it does seem that as a *sine qua non* the graduate should at least have a thorough knowledge of the language in which the Scriptures are written. Then again as regards the subject of examination, the only obligatory examination on the several branches of Theology is that of the primary examination for the B.D. degree. In all the other examinations the candidate has the option of choosing which group he desires to be examined in, and might, if so disposed, select in each case that of Apologetics—with a little Greek added. Now although Apologetics is a very interesting branch of Theology and one in which, particularly at the present time, every clergyman should be thoroughly grounded, one would hardly consider that proficiency in this one branch alone was sufficient to entitle a man to affix D. D. after his name. And as the option is given even to University Graduates to avail themselves of the Metropolitan degree, I am afraid that practically it will be found that even University candidates for the degree of D. D. will avail themselves as is only natural of this easy method of attaining their degree which is thus opened to them, particularly as it will rank on an equal standing with the University degree and will have the imprimatur of the whole Church in this Ecclesiastical Province; and consequently I cannot feel so

anguine as Provost Body that the Universities will not be injuriously affected; and therefore I consider that the tending of this Canon will be ultimately to lower the standard of all D.D. degrees.

Then again as to the vexed question of Text Books. The plan suggested by the Canon seems to me to be wanting in fidelity, and most ultimately lead either to a deadlock or else to a compromise which would be unworthy of our Church, and which certainly should not secure its imprimatur. Perhaps I can make my view of the matter clear with the aid of an example. Take for instance the question of Apostolical Succession. The Church as a whole considers this as a Divine institution, but there are certain members of our Church who consider it as merely a matter of Church organization; and suppose that one of the interested colleges should favor this latter view. Now when the question of a Text Book treating on the subject came up a college holding these views would naturally object and rightly too, to their students being examined in a work which taught views on this subject diametrically opposite to their own. In this case the Text Book objected to would have to be temporarily withdrawn and another substituted for it. Now this second or any subsequent Text Book must necessarily either teach the same doctrine or that already objected to, in which case the college would be compelled to object again and again, or else it must omit the subject altogether or treat it in accordance with the views of the College, and then of course the College in question would no longer object. Now this latter course I fear would be the one most likely to be adopted by the Board of Examiners for the sake of peace and harmony. Indeed such a course seems to have been in the minds of the framers of this Canon when in the 2nd par. of clause III they speak of two Text Books being appointed as alternative subjects. If on the other hand the majority of the Board of Examiners persisted in appointing two Text Books each containing the doctrine objected to; is it in human nature to suppose that the College after having twice formally rejected them, would quietly acquiesce in their students being examined in this to them objectionable doctrine? And if not, their students would necessarily be unable to avail themselves of the provisions of the Canon, and the College in question would be *in statu quo ante* and probably begin to agitate again for the privilege of conferring such degrees. And thus all the work of the Committee and the Synod would result in nothing. At all events whether my surmises are well or ill founded, and no one would be better pleased than myself if they should prove unfounded, provided the Church had not to sacrifice any matter of principle, it must be admitted that it would have been better had a discussion been had on their merits in the Synod.

Yours truly,

E. J. HAMMING.

Drummondville, 15th Oct., 1889.

SIR,—I have just read Principal Adams' letter in answer to my criticism on the Canon in Divinity degrees, as well as Provost Body's explanations, and desire to thank them both for their efforts to elucidate the difficulties which presented themselves to my mind. Whilst I am glad to admit that the meaning and purport of the Canon on some points has been made clearer, I feel bound to maintain that the terms in which the Canon is drawn up do not fully warrant the interpretation put upon them. If I understand Dr. Adams aright, each College and University individually names its representative on the Board of Examiners, and then the six representatives are formally recognized and appointed by each University and College. This, no doubt, is the intention which the committee meant the preamble and first enacting clause to express, but I submit

that it is difficult to read this intention in the words. All that the first enacting clause lays down is that one representative shall be appointed from each University and College, but it does not declare that he shall be appointed by his own University or College. The preamble is clear enough, but the enacting clause which follows, the all important part of a statute, is obviously ambiguous. That "the Canon could not make by-laws or regulations for any of the Colleges" need not have prevented the Committee from guarding against an interpretation which the terms of the preamble seem to suggest. For if the preamble, which states the reason and intent of what follows, speaks of each University and College as appointing the whole Board, surely the inference seems almost forced upon us that the terms following refer to the same manner of appointment. The proposition *from* has no canonical signification by which it must necessarily be held to mean *by*. Dr. Adams' explanation rests upon the assumption, "As the Board is to have its members nominated, one by each institution," which I have no doubt was intended, but intentions ought to be made plainer in a Canon, and this is all I maintain in support of my opinion that this Canon calls for improvement in its form.

I will not take up your space by any lengthened reference to the ingenious link which Principal Adams has constructed for uniting (2) and (3) without doing violence to the ordinary principles of language, but if I withdraw the word "absurd" as a somewhat exaggerated expression, I must yet refuse to accept the explanation given as naturally flowing from the context. The ordinary *prima facie* view is that clause 2 relates only to the appointment of a chairman. There is nothing else affirmed by the words, "The House of Bishops appoint one of their number"; what is the office or charge to which they appoint him? Chairman of the Board. If after the word "number" had followed a *member of the Board*, Dr. Adams' contention would have had more reason to justify it. A clause which begins with the intention of appointing, fails to fulfil its intention, and ends by *expressing the first object for which the appointment is made* would be, I was going to say, *absurd*. In any case, I trust the form will be altered at the next Synod, as well as provision made for a successor to the Chairman, which I am glad to see both the Provost of Trinity and the Principal of Bishop's College are agreed in thinking is desirable. The suggestion offered by Provost Body for getting over the difficulty without amendment I do not think would be consistent with the present terms of the Canon, nor do I think Dr. Adams' proposal to name a temporary chairman applicable to the case in hand since the Chairman must be a member of the House of Bishops and appointed by that House at a meeting of the Provincial Synod.

I had not overlooked clause 6 of Section III., but it did not appear to me that the provision for one or more assistant examiners would necessarily remove the possibility of unfairness. The examiner in chief will probably be on the staff of the University or College, which is the centre for holding the examination, and the assistant may be named from the same institution. There is no security, in the nature of the case, in such an arrangement. If on the other hand the examiner in chief came from some institution other than the one he was specially interested in there would be every possible guarantee that the examination would be conducted on an equal basis for all.

A. A. VON IFFLAND.

For further Home Field News see page 14. We are also obliged to hold over several communications through want of space.

There is a good saying: "That which is learned early is remembered late." Youth is the time to learn texts of Scripture and holy things.