

## THE BRETON'S PRAYER.

When the Breton mariner puts to sea, his prayer is, "Keep me, O my God! My boat is so small, and thy ocean is so wide."

On pathless waters, deep and dark,  
Trembling, I launch my fragile bark;  
So weak my hand, so strong the waves,  
So few the saved, so full the graves;—  
So small my boat, so wide the sea,  
O God, my Father, keep thou me,  
I know not what shall safely guide  
Me o'er the foaming, treacherous tide;  
Nor where the rocks and breakers lie,  
Nor which is shore, nor which is sky:—  
So small my boat, so wide the sea,  
What can I do but trust in thee?  
Like famished beast, the ocean raves,  
But thou art mightier than the waves;  
And still my prayers to Thee ascend,  
And still Thy skies above me bend:—  
Though small my boat, and wide the sea,  
Safely I sail, O God, with Thee.

—Fannie H. Marr.

## POLITICIANS IN THE PROVINCIAL SYNOD.

Contrary to general expectations the discussion in the Provincial Synod on the Jesuit question utterly failed to strike the key note of public opinion on the subject in the country. The Church of England stands discredited in the eyes of those who looked to her to lead the van in company with her sister churches in the Dominion on behalf of the great national movement in favor of Equal Rights.

The cause is not far to seek. The politicians in the Synod were determined to prevent a discussion on the subject, and timid clerics and laymen were overborne by the specious argument that the Church had nothing to do with a political question. While deprecating the discussion of the Jesuit question as a political issue more than one politician had the audacious inconsistency to appeal to the Synod not to imperil the cause of the party now in power by condemning its stand on the subject.

Most of the delegates from the Maritime Provinces were against the movement, and laid great stress upon the fact that the attempt to arouse public opinion in these Provinces on the question had signally failed. Not content with taking little or no interest in the question itself, they busied themselves in attempting to discount the efforts of the Ontario delegates in the matter for fear lest party interests should suffer.

As to the peril of the Quebec legislation to the welfare and unity of the Dominion, no one, save the Prolocutor, the Lay Secretary and a few others, seemed, to pay any heed. As to a calm and dispassionate consideration of this vital question, the Synod seemed to set its face against it from the start. And thus the matter was slurred over and virtually buried out of sight by being referred to a Committee which cannot report for three years, before which time the question of Equal Rights will have been decided at the polls.

It may be sufficient for some of the delegates to justify their action in the matter by protesting loudly that the Jesuit matter was a political question. Granted. But the majority of Churchmen will not be satisfied with such an excuse. Must the Church keep silence about every subject upon which politicians lay their corrupt hands? How is political life ever to be purified if Christian men hold aloof? Must we allow the nation to be governed by politicians altogether? Have Christian citizens no rights to assert, no duties to perform?

Not until Christian men rid themselves of the delusion that the Christian Church has no right to insist upon purity in political

as much as in social life, will the level of national life be elevated, its springs cleansed, and its tone raised. And not until Christian men rid themselves of party shackles will the Equal Rights movement succeed in establishing a strong, free, and Christian nationality in Canada.—*The Evangelical Churchman.*

## CORRESPONDENCE.

[The name of Correspondent must in all cases be enclosed with letter, but will not be published unless desired. The Editor will not hold himself responsible, however, for any opinions expressed by Correspondents.]

## DEGREES IN DIVINITY.

To the Editor of the Church Guardian:

SIR,—Lest silence on the part of members of the Committee of the Provincial Synod of 1886 on Divinity Degrees should be misconstrued I venture to make a few remarks on Canon Von Iffland's letter on the above subject, which appeared in your issue of October 2nd. The first objection appears to be that the Canon was hastily passed; the reason of this apparent haste was, as expressed to me by one of the leading laymen in the Synod that the members generally thought that "the details had been sufficiently threshed out by the Committee." They looked on the committee as specialists, and were willing to accept their work. If there was haste, it was the haste of the House, not of the committee, for members of the committee who rose to support the Canon could not be heard such was the eagerness of the general body of the House to pass the measure as it stood. The work represented the agreement of such varied opinions, and of so many various institutions. The draft Canon had been before the governing bodies of all the six institutions, one of them being the University of which Canon Von Iffland is a graduate and the measure had been unanimously approved by a Convocation, of which Canon Von Iffland had received notice in the usual way. Besides this the draft Canon had been in the hands of members for four weeks, and the inference I make from the ready assent of the House is that members had studied the Canon, and that they were satisfied with it. Canon Von Iffland objects that the Canon does not make clear how the Board of Examiners is to be appointed. As the Board is to have its members nominated, one by each institution, and then the formal appointment of the Board as the Examining Board for Divinity Degrees for each institution is to be made by each institution separately it seems to me that sufficient exactness is given by the undertaking already entered into that each and severally the institutions undertake "to recognize and formally to appoint" the whole number of persons severally nominated by each separate College as the College Board of Examiners in Divinity. The Canon could not make by-laws or regulations for any of the Colleges; but immediately one of the six institutions has appointed its representative on the Board, it would naturally be the duty of the Registrar of that College to communicate the choice of the College to the other five. A College which has accepted the Canon may be trusted to find out *who* its examiners are to be, and as it has no choice except in the case of its own representative, there is no danger of any misunderstanding, and certainly no need of any miraculous inspiration to hit upon the same names. In short each institution nominates one member of the Board and accepts the other five individually from the other institutions. Communications between the Registrar or Secretaries of the Institutions will inform all of the nominations, and what will follow will be the formal recognition by each institution of the six nominees. There is no informality of method in this. I think Canon Von Iffland in pointing out that no provision is made for the

election of a successor to the Bishop, who is Chairman of the Board, has hit a defect in the Canon. But could not this be met by the nomination to the Chairmanship of the Bishop of a certain Diocese without mentioning his name? Thus the successor in the See would be chairman; if this is not possible, every Board left accidentally without a chairman can certainly elect a temporary chairman, as indeed was done in the case of our own Committee upon the death of Bishop Binney.

I cannot agree that the word "also," in No. 3, is at all absurd; No. 2 does not "relate solely to the appointment of a chairman"; it reads thus: "And the House of Bishops shall at each session of the Provincial Synod appoint one of their number *who shall be Chairman of the Board.*" I contend the last words in italics express the first object for which the Bishop is appointed; and the "also" goes on to connect this with his second duty, that of "reporting to the Provincial Synod." Clause 2 has to do with the Bishop's work as Chairman in the Board; clause 3 has to do with his work as an organ of the Provincial Synod; a link in fact between the Board and the Synod. Surely it is not absurd to couple these two duties by the word "also," in Section III. referring to *Text Books*, the clause concerning the alternative text books, does not to my mind augur instability, but rather elasticity, which is often a great element in stability. The Board of Examiners (perhaps not unanimously) approve of a Text Book, one College does not accept this; the Board then nominates a second Text Book—if any College does not accept this, then the Board have the power of nominating the same two as alternatives or a third. All the nominating of Text Books is done by the Board.

As regards Section III, clauses 5, 6 and 7 have reference to the centres of examination and the supervision of the examiners. Section VI, which Canon Von Iffland appears to have overlooked, is as follows: "It shall be the duty of the Bishop of the Diocese, in which any such centre exists, to appoint one or more persons for such centre, to assist the Examiner in distributing papers and maintaining order during the examination. *One such assistant shall be present throughout the whole time of such examination;* that is a representative appointed by the Bishop of the Diocese, and one who is not an examiner. The Principal of the College has also the right to be present, and may in fact be the assistant, but if he is so appointed it is as the Bishop's representative and not *ex officio.* This proviso ought to be a sufficient guarantee of impartiality and fair play.

I may add that the objections made by Canon Von Iffland to the practical unanimity in favor of the Canon in the Lower House apply equally to the Upper House. The strong argument for accepting the Canon *en bloc* was the unanimity of the Committee of the Colleges, and of the House of Bishops.

THOMAS ADAMS,

Secretary of the Joint Committee.

Lennoxville, Oct. 3rd, 1889.

SIR,—Will you allow me to correct an inaccuracy in your able report of the recent Provincial Synod? I have reason to believe that uncertainty with regard to the same matter is generally prevalent among the clergy. You state that under the new Canon the Degrees are to be granted by the Metropolitan of Canada.

This is likely to produce the wrong impression, that the Universities have consented to hold their Degree-conferring powers in abeyance, and that all Degrees in Divinity are henceforth to be conferred by the Metropolitan.

Nothing could be more contrary to fact. The representatives of the Universities would never for an instant have consented to such an arrangement, or to any other proposal which infringed upon the chartered rights which they have