

The Sultan is about to address another autograph letter to Queen Victoria and the Emperor Napoleon on the subject of Syria, expressing his desire to have the sole punishment of the offences.

**BEYROUT** (via Marseilles) August 8.—Syria is tranquil; but in the environs of Damascus attempts against the life and property of the Christians are of daily occurrence. Admiral Martin has been sent with a strong squadron to the Syrian coast, with instructions to assist as much as possible in restoring tranquillity, and would doubtless direct his ships upon those points where they would be most needed. Our squadron consisted of four line-of-battle ships, two frigates, and three corvettes. Kurechid Pascha was about to be sent under arrest to Constantinople, as his conduct required a strict enquiry and if found as iniquitous as alleged severe punishment. Lord Dufferin the Commissioner of the English Government in Syria, carries with him an order to Admiral Martin to land 1,600 seamen and marines to co-operate with the French troops in maintaining order in the district of Beyrout. Letters from Toulon and Marseilles give various particulars concerning the departure of the Syrian expedition which, if correct, would make it appear that considerably more than 6,000 men will be sent.

**INDIA**—Calcutta exchange 21. The Indigo prospects are more favourable.

Latest China advices say that Ted Chow was sacked and burned. The Imperial troops are said to have joined the rebels.

### AFRICA.

**EGYPT**.—A letter from Alexandria says some Europeans of Cairo, fearing for the safety of that town, the Musselman population of which exceeds 300,000 souls, the consul of France informed the Viceroy. The latter replied that he would answer for the security of the Europeans, not only in Cairo but in all Egypt. It appears certain that we shall not witness in Egypt massacres like those in the other provinces of the Ottoman Empire.

## Communications.

### CONGREGATIONAL SINGING.

To the Editors of the Canadian Church Press.

GENTLEMEN,—I was glad to find in your issue of the 16th ult., an article on the "Congregational Singing of the Church." I have had the same experience in a London Church as your "Englishman" had in Germany. There were 300 people all of them chanting the psalms—ALL of them making the responses—ALL of them repeating the prayers; in fact, ALL of them were worshipping.

But there is a strange prejudice against the musical services of the Church of England. It is called "unprotestant." Your "Englishman" shows that it is most Protestant, for Germany is the birth-place of Protestantism, and is especially noted for congregational singing. Those who call it "unprotestant" should remember that the Romish Church exalts the priesthood so much, that the people have little to do with the public service. They should also go to St. Michael's Church, Toronto, and see that the worship there is chiefly conducted by priests, aided by a mixed choir in a box over the heads of the congregation.

Let these same people go into many of the English Churches, and they will find the service to be, for the most part, a duet between the priest and the clerk or a few scattered people at most. A chant or two perhaps, with an equal number of metrical psalm tunes, are performed by a choir up in a box over the heads of the people. Now, what difference is there between such Protestant services in our Church and the services of the Romish Church?

Now in the much-abused services of well-instructed Churchmen, we have the congregational element developed to the full. The priest reads the Scriptures to the people. He also exhorts, and, in the Communion service, offers up prayers for them. In all other cases he is with them, as their leader, not rising above the level of a simple worshipper in the glorious antiphonal chanting of the psalms! Where is the setting up of the priest above the people in this arrangement? The secret of the opposition lies in the unwelcomeness to the natural man of services, the warmth of which revives the vitality and growth of the Church.

It is a very great mistake to suppose that musical talent is necessary to produce such services in our congregations. This is far from being the case; for any one who can read, can intone much more easily; and if the clergyman intone, as it is directed, the congregation would soon adopt his note. It may be introduced in any service, without exciting opposition. I always naturally intone, and all that I hear on the subject is, how very distinctly people in remote corners of large buildings can hear every syllable. The great object must always be to have the simplest music possible, except in the anthem, which may be as ornate as the choir is capable of. To this end I should utterly repudiate double chants, for in them a composer can fly off at a tangent from ancient simplicity to modern wildness. I have a quadruple chant in my possession, and I am glad of it, for it shows the error of departing from the principle of a complete musical sentence to a complete verbal sentence.—I am, yours truly,

W. S. V.

### DIMINUTION OF DIOCESES.

To the Editors of the Canadian Church Press.

GENTLEMEN.—A further reason for urging the diminution of the extent of Canadian dioceses as they now exist, is found in the mutual ignorance of each other in which both bishops and clergy at present live. Any one who has read of the familiar converse between a bishop and his clergy, in the earliest days of the Church—his knowledge of the peculiar fitness of each for the work of the ministry—his learning—his soundness in the faith—his ability to govern a portion of the flock by himself, or his need of being placed with another more fitted to guide alone,—will see the difference from all this in these later days. How can a bishop know very much of his clergy, when he only meets them for a few hours (and then, too, in company with others, some of them laymen perhaps) at his triennial confirmation tour—or when they may come to town, and pay him a brief

formal visit of courtesy? Still less can he learn anything of them at his "visitation," for then the chances are small indeed for the humble pastor of a few sheep in the wilderness to obtain paternal advice from his Father in God. How little is really known by a bishop, not only of the private circumstances of his clergy, but of the true spiritual state of their parishes! How different, in many cases, is the congregation on which the bishop's eye falls at his "confirmation visit" from that which he would see were he suddenly and unexpectedly to present himself in the same church on any other Sunday! And although allowance is doubtless made on such occasions for much unusual attendance, yet there will remain, in the minds of those seeing things thus, an idea of life and growth which a more intimate and reliable acquaintance with the places would by no means bear out.

Of course, not being a layman, I cannot speak of the feelings of a layman upon the matter of a bishop's visitation as it ought to be—as it cannot be while dioceses are so large. I mean by visitation not what is now known by that name, but the visiting by the bishop of the several parishes in his diocese. But as a clergyman, I am sure I should be torn out by the earnest and hardworking pastor, when I say that a fatherly, friendly visit, at informal times, from the bishop, would nerve with fresh vigour, and excite to increased exertion, many a heart well nigh sinking in loneliness and disappointment. Surely, having an experienced, earnest and kind chief pastor, whose judgment would at once correct and amend whatever might be faulty and deficient, while his sympathy cheered, and his earnestness and kindness served as incentives. The clergy of such a bishop would not be found wallowing in the day of trial. And what an influence for good upon the little ones of the flock, would be wrought by a truly apostolic Father of the Church! How would they be strengthened in the faith when, in after years, they could call to mind some kind word of encouragement or praise, spoken to them by their bishop in their early days! We should have, indeed, in such a case, a household of faith—a well ordered family, each member willing to suffer, if need be, for the others' good.

But for this to be in the power of one man, he must have a reasonable space to do it in. It would be, perhaps, impossible to accomplish it in a diocese as large as Toronto will be, even after its eastern portion has been set off. But what it seems advisable to bring about, is to have the need of at least facilitating this acknowledged, for then, God willing, active and earnest men will be found to carry it out when extreme opposition has been withdrawn. And we may be sure that the more men take to their hearts the nature and the extent—the depth and importance—of a bishop's work, the more will they acknowledge as right, and be prepared to support, all measures for having it done thoroughly.—I am, Gentlemen, yours, &c.,

PRESBYTER.

We have received from Adelaide a copy of a pamphlet—"A Reply to Certain Statements publicly made by Sir R. G. Macdonnell, O. B., in reference to the Constitution and Proceedings of the Diocesan Synod." By Alexander R. Russell, Incumbent of St. Paul's, and Rural Dean.—Sir R. G. Macdonnell, at the meeting of the Synod, in June, 1859, brought forward some resolutions which our readers will find in the September number of last year, in page 359. They were intended to ally the Church "with the other Protestant evangelical denominations in the Colony." It was resolved that they should not be taken into consideration. We believe if they had been carried, they would have done much to bring synodical action into disrepute, and to separate the Church of Adelaide from the Church of England. Sir Richard Macdonnell, who is Governor of the Colony, seems to have been very angry at the rejection of his resolutions, and has written a letter, which has appeared in the Adelaide paper, in which the constitution and proceedings of the Synod are made the subject of very free criticism. He objects chiefly to voting by orders and to the Bishop's veto, and he is completely answered as to his facts and his arguments by Mr. Russell. We are happy to say that the majority of the lay delegates are opposed to Sir Richard Macdonnell. "The public will now see how far Sir Richard Macdonnell was entitled to put himself forward as the exponent of the views of the laity of his own Church, and how far his statements on matters of fact are worthy of credence. In concluding his objections to the vote by Orders, he makes no allusion to the resolutions proposed by him in Synod last year, which is peculiarly unfortunate for his own purpose. Sir Richard brought forward his series of resolutions on what was incorrectly called Church Alliance. By whom was the previous question carried? By the Clergy? No; they were equally divided. It was a majority of the laity who refused to give him permission to bring forward his resolutions. Having been defeated by a majority of his own Order, is it ingenuous to throw the odium of that defeat on others? It was a layman that on that occasion demanded the vote by Orders; it was a lay majority that decided the question."—Page 9. We doubt if the Governor of a Colony is acting in accordance with his position in being a candidate for an office in the Colony. Sir Richard Macdonnell was delegate for Trinity Church. The following paragraph from the Church Chronicle for Adelaide shows that he is in a minority even there:—"TRINITY CHURCH VESTRY.—The attempt made in this Vestry, April 24, to damage, if not to overthrow the Diocesan Synod, by dissolving the connexion of the parish with it, was signally defeated by a majority in favour of electing Synodsmen of 39 to 11. We trust that such endeavours to destroy an organization, which, in spite of the difficulties impeding its early development and subsequent working, has done good, will now cease; and that the minority will not persist in obstructing that which they cannot overthrow. In spite of unusual influences brought to bear on this Vestry, the Vestrymen of Trinity resolved to think for themselves, and have most unmistakably endorsed with their approval the combined action of Bishop, Clergy, and Laity, in Synod assembled."—C. C. Chronicle.