

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.—The report of the University Commission has been communicated to the Vice-Chancellor, and will shortly be made public. Coinciding in many respects with the recommendations of the Statute Revision Syndicate, it recommends consolidation of the statutes and of the by-laws enacted from time to time by the Senate; modifications in the jurisdiction of the University over the town; alterations in the number and functions of the officers of the University; the adoption of the changes in the constitution and powers of the Caput; the extension of the law relating to minors to all undergraduate students; the addition of civil engineering, modern languages, and diplomatic science, to the present range of studies; an alteration in the examinations, so as to include in the little-go most of the subjects necessary for a B. A. degree, and to devote the remaining four (instead of five) terms to the preparation for the mathematical, classical, or sciences tripos, or for degrees in law and medicine; the retention of the ten-year-men privilege, and the creation of a cheap degree for "Licentiate in Theology" for the poorer Clergy; the establishment of seven "boards of studies" for the several branches of University tuition; the shortening of the term of residence for medical students; the abolition of oaths and tests in some cases, and in others the substitution of an affirmation, which an express disclaimer of any intention to offer an opinion as to the admission of Dissenters; the appointment of additional theological and other Professors; the abolition of the tutorial and collegiate system of instruction after the fifth term, and the substitution of a system of University instruction by a large staff of Professors and Lecturers, to be paid out of an assessment upon the college revenues, the appropriation of the Hulse foundation to a Professorship, instead of a more lecture, of two Stalls in Ely Cathedral to theological chairs, and of the Worts foundation for Travelling Bachelors to a regular system of instruction in diplomacy and the laws of nations; the relief of the University from the tax upon degrees, not imposed either upon London University or upon the Scotch Universities; the erection of additional lecture rooms with laboratories and other appurtenances; the establishment of a reading room open to undergraduates in connection with the University library; the substitution of a money payment for the copies of new works under the Copyright Act; a power of taxation for academic purposes over the members of the University; the substitution of affiliated pensionaries for licensed lodgings; the abolition of various restrictions, except that of celibacy, upon the Fellowships; the abolition of the tenure of ecclesiastical preferment with the headship of houses; and a revision of the college statutes—especially those of King's and of Trinity Hall.—*Jhon Bull.*

TORONTO VOCAL MUSIC SOCIETY.

Rooms—St. Lawrence Building.
Regular practice every Wednesday, at Eight P. M.—
Terms of admission, Performing Members 20s. per annum;
Nonperforming 25s.
J. P. CLARKE, Mus. Bac. Conductor.
G. B. WYLLIE, Secretary & Treasurer.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

A list of letters and remittances will be given next week.

Canadian Churchman.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 6, 1853.

NOTICE.

The Clergy are respectfully reminded that the Collection appointed to be made on the 2nd Sunday in January, in all the Churches, Chapels, and Stations, is to be appropriated this year to the Theological Student's Fund.

THOMAS S. KENNEDY,
Sec. C. S. D. T.

LEGISLATION FOR THE COLONIAL CHURCH.

It is not improbable that during the present session of the Imperial Parliament some definite measure will be passed for giving the Church in the Colonies, the power of managing its own affairs. The decision upon Mr. Gladstone's Bill having only been postponed to give time for obtaining the opinions of the several Colonial Churches.

Though opinion may be divided as to the expediency of reviving the Convocation, in England, there appears to be but one sentiment here upon the necessity of the Colonial Church being vested with certain Synodical powers.

Wherever any state of things has grown up, for which no existing laws are available, some system must be framed to meet such a state of things: and however much we may assume in theory that the Church here, is governed by English Ecclesiastical Law, yet that law is to us, almost a dead letter, inas-

much as there are no Courts to give it effect.

Hence the necessity for some system of Ecclesiastical Law and Judicature suitable for the requirements of a Colonial Church. The owner, therefore, the Colonial Churches are empowered to act in this matter for themselves, the better.

The chief difficulties attending the subject appear to relate to the Supremacy of the Crown; and the degree of control or interference to be allowed to local Legislatures.

The Supremacy of the Crown can scarcely be exercised here, in the same manner as in England. There, from the incorporation of the Church with the State, all Church Laws are part of the Law of the Land: nor can any change in them be made but through an Act of Parliament, followed by the Royal assent. Here, the Church is not in the same position, at least practically, however the theory may have continued the same. It is desired to make the Church independent of the State,—to withdraw all peculiar privileges, and to place it exactly on the same footing as other religious Bodies.

But the Church has one peculiar feature which seems to stand in the way of this viz; the distinctness with which she affirms the Supremacy of the Crown in all matters Ecclesiastical as well as civil. This appears to present the same absolute severance from the State in the case of the Church as in the case of other religious Bodies; at least from the head of the State; the acknowledgment of the Supremacy of the Crown in Ecclesiastical matters not, of course, including any Supremacy of Parliament.

This Supremacy is so positively affirmed in the first of the Three Articles subscribed by the Clergy at their Ordination, according to the 36th Canon, as well as in the 37th of the Articles of Religion: and the recognition of the same principle runs so clearly through the whole Book of Prayer, that it may well be a matter of grave doubt whether it ought not to be still maintained inviolate by the Church throughout all the Colonial territories of the Empire. Indeed, our acknowledgment of the Royal Supremacy is so comprehensive in its terms, that it seems to require that no cause or matter should be definitely settled without the assent of the Crown being attained.

In the civil legislation of the Colonies the inconvenience of reference to a distant Imperial Head is removed by the appointment of a resident Governor, empowered to act as deputy, and authorized in most cases to give or withhold the Royal assent, or to send a Bill home at his discretion. But the Royal Supremacy could not be exercised in the same way in Church matters, the Governor General unlike the King or Queen, not being under the special obligation of an oath to protect the Church, nor being necessarily a member of the Church, and being too much subject to the influence of political factions to be entrusted with even a delegated Supremacy over the Church.

To avoid, therefore, breaking in upon the principle of the Royal Supremacy, as it is at present acknowledged by the whole Church in all parts of the Empire, the only alternative seems to be—that all acts of a Colonial Church Convocation designed to have the effect of laws or canons should be reserved for the assent of the Crown.

Probably this would not be attended with so much inconvenience as on first thought might be supposed. For a Convocation would not usually meet more frequently than once a year, and the delay consequent upon such reference would not be greater than in many important civil questions. It would be likely to prevent the adoption of crude measures, and would induce a feeling of gravity and responsibility when it should be felt that all the laws of such Convocation must be submitted to the approval of the Crown. It would also operate as a check,—which is always salutary,—as much to the proceedings of the many as of the few. Neither would it hamper the free action of the Convocation, inasmuch as the Church would not want to be constantly legislating. The chief work would be at the outset, viz., in framing a suitable code of canons and regulations for the Church in the Province, which being once done, the amount of important rules to be made and transmitted for the sanction of the Crown, would not be very great.

The sanction of the Crown would give to the acts of the Convocation greater weight with the members of the Church generally, and would maintain loyalty of feeling. Such a system would also obviate any objections which might be raised, against giving the Colonial Churches the power of internal self-government, on the score of such power being incompatible with the Royal Supremacy, and tending to dismember the National Church.

CLERGY RESERVES.

We have much satisfaction in laying before our readers the following extract from the English Churchman. The decision enunciated so distinctly by Sir John Pakington, is precisely what might have been looked for from an Administration headed by the Earl of Derby.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

UPPER CANADA CLERGY RESERVES.

FRIDAY.—Sir W. Molesworth asked the Secretary for the Colonies whether it was the intention of the ministers to bring in a Bill to enable the Canadian Legislature to dispose of the Clergy reserves, subject to the condition that the stipends and allowances heretofore assigned and given to the Clergy of the Church of England and Scotland, or to any other religious bodies or denominations of Christians in Canada, should be secured during the natural lives and Incumbencies of the parties now receiving the same?

Sir J. Pakington said he had received an address on the subject, founded upon certain resolutions adopted by the Canadian House of Assembly and in answering the question of the hon. baronet he begged to state that he felt very great regret that the forms of the House precluded him from accompanying his answer with the explanation which he most strongly desired to make upon the subject. But bound as he was by those forms, he could only say Her Majesty's Government had given the fullest and most anxious consideration to this difficult question, and to the whole of the circumstances under which it had been forced upon their attention; and his answer now was that, considering that this was essentially an Upper Canadian question, and that the representatives of Upper Canada were, as nearly as possible, equally divided upon it (an ironical cheer from Sir William Molesworth)—considering that the majority which had carried the resolutions he had referred to consisted, in a large proportion, of Roman Catholic members of the lower province, whose religion had been amply and magnificently endowed—considering that the Act of 1840 was proposed and accepted by all parties as a final settlement of this long discussed and most difficult question—and considering above all that the Act of 1840 was part of the arrangement made by the Act of Union of the two Provinces—considering all these circumstances, it was not the intention of Her Majesty's Government to introduce any Bill for the purpose of enabling the Canadian Legislature to dispose of the proceeds of the Clergy reserves in the manner referred to by the hon. gentleman.

Sir W. Molesworth then gave notice that immediately after the Christmas recess, he should move for leave to bring in a Bill to enable the Legislature of Canada to dispose of the Clergy reserves of that province, in accordance with the promises given by Her Majesty's late Government (Hear, hear, from the Radical Benches.)

CONGREGATIONAL SINGING.

This is an old subject; but one which will bear thinking of again and again. Our singing is professedly congregational, and yet how far does it stand from real congregational singing. Some few, I know, especially members of choirs, declare that singing in Church ought not to be congregational. Their fastidious ears, forsooth, cannot endure to hear the discords which would arise if a whole body of uncultivated voice was to be brought into play; as though a few discords should be allowed to weigh against the warmth and earnestness which are engendered by the lifting up of the voice of a unanimous congregation. Such persons look at the matter in a mere musical point of view. The regard the psalm as a performance which is to give pleasure to the singers and hearers, much more than as an act of joint devotion. But they are wrong even in a musical point of view. How few choirs are there in which there is not some voice which is not quite even, or in which all the performers sing their parts accurately! Now amongst a few the discords are heard, and heard painfully, because the thoughts and feelings are not absorbed by devotion, but the people are listening to the music. But when a whole congregation unite, their devotional feelings absorb their attention, and they do not think of the discords: not only so, but in a vast body of voices they are not perceived: besides this how few are those whose ears are so accurate as to be affected by a few discords.

It must not, however, be understood that we would confine ourselves to congregational singing. We desire to see every talent consecrated to God's service; and therefore we would allow the highest musical talent to find scope in divine worship, where such talent exists. But the Church has provided one place, or one portion of the service, in which that talent may be legitimately exercised, viz, the Anthem, after the third collect. The Anthem is a part of the service which is appropriate to the higher musical composition, and so gives scope for the higher musical talent. The congregation are not expected to join in vocally. To them it is the vehicle and the aid of devout thoughts and feelings; but they are not expected to join with the voice. If indeed any of them are competent to unite in the chorus of an

anthem, there is no reason why they should not do so; for very few choirs comprise a sufficiency of voices to give a chorus effectively; so that any aid from good voices is desirable. But it is not desirable that any but correct singers should join in the chorus of an anthem; and none but the choir should ordinarily sing the other parts; because if they do, the effect will be injured by the want of balance and proportion between one part and another. This then is the portion of the service, which may be legitimately restricted to the choir: and we are inclined to think that several of the defects of our Church music are attributable to its being forgotten.

One chief cause of the want of congregational singing is the selection of tunes which the congregation cannot sing. This divides itself into three portions:—either they are tunes too difficult for the majority of persons; or they are pitched so high that the majority of persons, especially of men, cannot reach them; or they are changed so frequently that the congregation have not time to learn them, so as to sing them with ease. Now why do choirs choose difficult chants and psalm tunes? Simply because their leaders find that a little difficulty is necessary to keep up the interest, especially when the members of the choir are volunteers. Now if the anthem were kept up in its recognized place, there would be always a legitimate opening for this demand of difficulty; for anthems are all more or less difficult; and the number of them in existence will always supply a difficulty in music for those who desire to surmount it. Again, why are most tunes pitched so high? Because they are constructed for choral performance, instead of congregational use; they are made to suit the voices of a select few, instead of those of the mass. But if the few had a legitimate field for the exercise of their talent, they would be more willing to sing the chants and psalm tunes at such a pitch as would suit the majority of the congregation. Still again, why are the tunes changed so frequently? Because the choirs require some novelty to sustain their interest, and to keep them to regularity of attendance. But if they had as many new anthems as they chose, they would be better satisfied to have fewer changes in the chants and psalm tunes; indeed they would be less able to give their own attention to the getting up of new tunes of that description.

All this shows the desirableness of reviving the anthem in its proper place. But when we speak of anthems, we must not be understood to confine ourselves to prose anthems. Every person versed in the subject knows that there were metrical anthems in ancient times, and that there are such now. And perhaps in many congregations it would be best to take the more difficult psalm tunes, and sing them in the place of the anthem, after the third collect. Let then each choir be allowed and encouraged to have one portion of the service, in which they may sing their more difficult and elaborate psalm tune or anthem; and let them at the same time be desired and instructed so to sing at other times, especially in those parts appointed to be chanted, that the body of the congregation may join with them. This is much more done in England than it was; and it arises in part from the revival of the practice of anthem singing after the third collect.

But we are bound to say that a very considerable change requires to be made by most or all of our choirs, before we shall have good congregational singing. The most essential change is the selection of such chants as the body of singing voices in a congregation can sing. It is a great mistake to suppose that, in congregational psalmody, a few treble voices ought to engross the air of the tune. And yet that must be the case with a large number of our chants and psalm tunes, because they are set so high that even many treble voices cannot sing them; and the greater part of them entirely exclude men, unless they can sing bass or tenor. Now it is too much to expect all our men to sing these parts. Many have not depth of voice to sing bass, and many have not skill; still fewer have skill to sing tenor as a separate part. And why should men be excluded from singing the air of the tunes? Is it seemly that the women and children should take the lead in congregational singing? We think that St. Paul would say, No. Indeed we are persuaded that, as a matter of taste it would be much more agreeable to the ear to hear the air of the tune supported by a body of voices in which the strength of the man's voice should predominate, and in which the female voice should come in to add softness and grace, instead of being strained, as it too often is now into a piercing shrillness. We have heard ladies express this opinion; and our experience of a few congregations where that is the case, has long convinced us of the truth of what we say. We feel sure that it is only requisite for our organists and choir-masters to lower the pitch of most of the