

of women for the same work, the latter will have to be content with less wages than the former in all cases in which the work cannot be done entirely by women.

B.

Wanted—Specialists in Church Music.

I HAVE frequently been appealed to by churches for help in securing a competent and sympathetic manager for their music. What is wanted was thus expressed in one case:

Our church is hardly satisfied with our present music, more particularly as to its results in developing music in the congregation and among our young people. Can you direct our attention to an organist who is an earnest Christian and a good leader, who would take an interest in training the young voices in our Sunday-school, and in keeping the church music thoroughly in sympathy with the remainder of the service, and helpful to the worship of the congregation? To the right man we can offer an opportunity to do some good work, and reasonably good pay for it. The times are ripe for the man.

Many such expressions have come to me in letters and conversations. They all look the same way: Wanted—a Christian musician, trained, tactful, enthusiastic, bent upon stimulating and guiding the musical life of a parish so that it will contribute directly and powerfully to the prime objects of church life. A leading Western pastor says, "The need is great, and I imagine the demand will before long be strenuous."

Something should be done in the matter. We have seminaries for training pastors, schools for training lay teachers and helpers of various kinds, and numerous temporary classes and assemblies for studying all sorts of Christian work. But what about this uniquely effective arm of parish organization—the music? The problem is beset by undeniable difficulties—difficulties in the attitude of churches to their music, in the attitude of musical students not only to church music, but to Christian work in general, and in some of the practical details involved in any proposed solution. The following suggestions are feasible:

There is a noble opening for a school exclusively devoted to training *church musicians*. The conditions of admission should be simply genuine Christian enthusiasm, a declared intention to serve the musical needs of the churches, and reasonable musical aptitude. Courses should be provided for both organists and singers, but all should have minute discipline as leaders and teachers. The subjects taught should be (1) church music—theory and history—as a branch of Christian work; (2) sight-reading, as a stimulus to true musical sensitiveness, as an introduction to singing, and as a subject for popular instruction; (3) voice-building, with reference to both speaking and singing; (4) choral singing, as the central department of all music, especially of sacred music, to be extended to oratorio work, if possible; (5) harmony, for the organist an indispensable tool, for the singer a constant guide, and for all the key to the inner mysteries of musical construction; (6) analysis and criticism, both as an artistic discipline and for popular exposition; (7) organ-playing and solo-singing as specialties in church work. To these might be added several courses for more extended technical information and equipment.

The entire management should be in Christian hands. The aim should be immediate practical utility rather than artistic achievement. Instruction for those who do

not mean to be primarily church musicians should be left entirely to other schools. Courses should be so arranged as to permit students to accomplish much in a short time. Certificates should be granted for demonstrated attainments. To establish confidence and preclude misuse, the enterprise should be connected with some recognized institution, preferably a theological seminary, though sectarianism should be avoided.

That there is nothing like this now provided is, I think, a fact. Some of the teaching of what is called "church music" is only a menace to true devotional art. A different ideal, and a more radical specialization, are imperative for permanent success. Much might be added, if space permitted, to justify and fill out the outline of effort here suggested.

HARTFORD THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY. *Waldo S. Pratt.*

The Australian Registry of Land Titles.

A REPLY TO MR. EDWARD ATKINSON'S ARTICLE IN THE CENTURY FOR FEBRUARY, 1892, BY THE DEAN OF THE LAW SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, AND PROFESSOR OF THE LAW OF REAL ESTATE AND CONVEYANCING.

THE objections to the adoption in the United States of the Australian registry of land titles are two:

(1) The Constitution of the United States forbids the United States, or any State, to deprive any person of property without due process of law; that is, without a course of legal proceedings including the establishment of a competent tribunal, the service of process requiring the appearance of all parties whose rights may be affected by the judgment in the particular cause, and an opportunity to such parties of a hearing before judgment. No indefeasible title could result in the United States from a public registry upon the Australian plan, for the title of an adverse claimant could not be concluded until the statutory period of limitation had barred his claim.

(2) The operation of the system would require the appointment of a large number of government employees, and it would compel the Government, national, State, or municipal, as the case might be, to engage in a business—that of insuring titles—which can be better and less expensively done by non-official agencies.

Registry laws requiring the recording in public offices of conveyances of, and liens and encumbrances upon, land have been in force in this country from the earliest colonial days. Any one who is familiar with the expense, delay, and danger of English conveyancing, and with the comparative inexpensiveness, speed, and safety of American conveyancing, will see the advantages of the American system, which practically compels the recording of all dealings with land *inter vivos* by postponing the unrecorded deed or lien to that which has been recorded, and which yet protects an unrecorded title against all parties having actual notice.

But the system is not perfect, because it does not cover devises or descents of land, and because there are dangers of false personation in acknowledgments, and of forgery, and because land is not as readily transferable as a ship or a share of corporate stock. The recording system should be amended in the following respects:

(1) All conveyances of, and encumbrances upon, land within each county of a State should be registered in the same public office.