

COLONIZATION AND THE CHURCH.

BY ERNEST HEATON, BARRISTER.

(Concluded from last week.)

It is unfortunate that the average immigrant is inclined to be, if not socialistic, very democratic in his views. And all experienced colonists will bear witness that, before he has gained actual experience under new conditions, the new arrival very generally out-democrates the most democratic. For this reason to many the more unrestrained democracy of the United States has peculiar attractions; the assumption being, apparently, that in that country Jack is more truly as good as his master, and, therefore, he has a better chance of pushing himself to the top. In the more unsettled districts of the United States, as might be expected, we may find the tendency we have described most completely developed, because there the traditions of the older civilization are more generally and more aggressively despised. In the newspapers of the Western States, we occasionally read of women White Caps. The explanation of this term the writer lately learned in his travels in the West. It appears that in certain settlements of the Western States human beings have gone back to first principles. The immoral orgies of young girls of presumably respectable parentage, not long ago, reached such a pitch that respectable women, not coarse, raw-boned creatures, as we might expect, but delicate, refined mothers of families, in self-defence, were compelled to take the matter into their own hands and form an association to inflict substantial corporal punishment upon the offenders, in order to prevent society from being completely destroyed. It is a well-known saying that "there is no God west of Denver, and no Sunday west of the Missouri River. This, if not literally, is practically true. It is estimated that in San Francisco not more than two per cent. of the population attend church. The Durant case is the story of a crime which the newspapers have made well known. This crime, like the exploits of the outlaws, Evans and Sontag, so notorious in Southern California some two years ago, was dramatized under the name of the Crime of the Century, but unlike the former, which proved a financial success, the performance of the play was stopped by the authorities. The most skillful colonizers in Southern California advertise in their pamphlets that in that country civilization is founded upon agriculture, and therefore is of a higher character than that in the northern part of the State, which was originally based upon mining, and that here, unlike northern California, Sunday is observed, and consequently it is a better country for respectable people to go to. At the same time no one who had been brought up in England or in Canada could fail to be struck with the fact that seven men out of ten in Southern California are professed atheists, and they make no secret of their profession either in their language or their lives. We might dwell on the number of divorces, the looseness of the marriage tie, the slow and uncertain administration of justice to criminals; we might point out that a nation which obtained a portion of Maine in 1849 by the suppression of an important map, and which offered mistranslations of Russian documents and false affidavits in the Behring Sea arbitration, is not more scrupulous in private transactions, if we may judge from the unfortunate experience of English investors, who have buried more than one hundred million of dollars west of the Missouri river, which brings in less than one per cent. interest. But there is

little to be gained by dwelling further on a comparison of morals. On this one point, however, most Canadians, whether living in Canada or the United States, will agree that amid all the points of similarity which tend to induce political union, the one distinguishing feature which more than anything else will keep the two countries politically apart is the lower tone in the social business and political life of the United States, which makes it a less desirable country for the bringing up of children—a condition of things which is the natural result of uniting the ambition and natural abandon of the immigrant, without restraint, face to face with the primary elements of existence, in a country which professedly despises the ways that are old. The superiority of Canada in this respect may be attributed without doubt to the influence of British connection and the more marked impress which British ideas and traditions have left upon the country. There is surely room in the English colonies for all the surplus population of Great Britain, and with a rapid growth of population induced by scientific colonization, the colonies would afford ample chances for making money within the British Dominion. There is sufficient choice of climate to satisfy the varied tastes of those who may want to launch out. If the English Church is interested, as she professes to be, in the social condition of the people at home, and if her interest is not cut short when as emigrants they embark at an English port, she will see that the interests of religion are truly served by using the whole force of her influence in preventing emigrants from straying outside the British flag, and in stemming the inevitable tide of moral retrogression abroad, in order that the advancing wave of civilization within the British Empire may present a moral and Christian front, which in the work of spreading Christianity, if not so dramatic, would, at any rate, be more effective than all the efforts of missionaries among heathen that are black.

CORRECTION.—In last week's issue of the above article read eight hundred thousand, instead of eight thousand, of those who passed through Canada to the United States.

THE QUESTION OF PATRONAGE.

COMMUNICATED—No. 3.

When we come to Ante-Nicene times and find St. Cyprian and others speaking of the bishops and clergy as the elect of the people, we need to recall the admonition of the Bishop of Ripon (Addresses on Preaching): "Phrases are enemies of truth." Election, with its group of phrases, meant, in the days of the Roman Empire, something very different from what goes by that name with us. The conditions that were imposed as to eligibility of candidates and the powers of the presiding officers in a popular election in the Roman Empire, would be deemed by us to utterly vitiate the principle of popular election and regulate it out of existence. It was the function of the presiding officer to examine the candidate in set form before the votes were recorded. He could refuse to take account of votes which were given for a candidate which did not satisfy him, and in default of other candidates, he could himself nominate candidates and declare them duly elected, and the election was only complete when he formally announced it. In the time of St. Cyprian even this form of election, giving a stone for bread, in our English point of view, had been superseded throughout the Empire, though possibly not wholly so in Africa, by election by the senate, subject only to a formal approval by the people (See Dic.

Christian Aut., p. 1,503). Only the chief officers in the State, corresponding to the bishops in the Church, were chosen and appointed under the form of an election, and that such as we have referred to above; they themselves appointed their subordinates without even a formal submission of the names to either the people or the Senate. Alexander Severus, Emperor (A.D. 222-235), voluntarily limited his own privilege in this respect in making important provincial appointments, by consulting the people as to the character and fitness for their duties of his nominees: "*Hostans populum ut si quis quid haberet criminis probasset manifestis ebus.*" He gave as his reason for this course the example of the method of appointments in the Christian Church. But Alexander Severus simply carried out what is contained in the Niagara Canon of Patronage. The principle of that Canon then was the rule and custom of the Church when St. Cyprian was Bishop of Corthage (A.D. 226). The influences of that age acting upon the Church within and without, as she travailed of her Nicene polity, bringing it into clear and definite form, made unmistakably and powerfully for this rule of patronage. We have seen how true this was as to the civil methods of appointment to office, and though Gore and others have shown Dr. Hatch's theory of the Church evolving her institutions out of the public life of the Roman Empire to be unhistorical as well as rationalistic, yet we know that the growth and development of the Church took something of the impress of the civil organization and polity of the age. As to the influences from within, incomparably the greatest of these was that of St. Cyprian. The Archbishop of Canterbury tells us that his influence upon the organization and legislation of the Ante-Nicene Church was far greater than that even of Hildebrand upon the mediæval, and the ideal St. Cyprian taught to embody in the corporate life of the Church necessitates this rule of patronage. That ideal was "the bishop in the Church, and the Church in the bishop." "The bishop in the Church"—that is, the Church has the Divine gift in her life of the Apostle of the flock, the instructor and the judge, therefore the bishop does nothing without the information and advice of the presbyters, deacons and laity. "The Church in the bishop"—that is, the bishop is the embodiment of the Church, which needs, necessarily, no other representation. So we find St. Cyprian held that the bishop had the right of appointing the inferior clergy, and that he exercised that right himself (Ep. 29); and this right of appointment is again insisted upon in his Epistles to the African and Spanish clergy (Ep. 68). The same principle is stated in his letters to Cornelius, Bishop of Rome. And there is a consensus as to this rule of patronage from Cyprian, through Jerome and Ambrose, down to the last of the fathers, Gregory the Great, who strenuously reserves to the bishops the power of selecting parish priests and deacons on the ground that in choosing a bishop the clergy and people transferred to him all rights of election to the inferior offices (Thomasin Discip. ii. 7, c. 34). There was one influence sometimes felt in the early Church which we must not pass over. It arose from the humility of holy men and their shrinking from the office of the priesthood. When these men were well known and beloved the violence of popular enthusiasm practically compelled their ordination, but not in opposition to the bishop (Porsidius *In vita*, Aug., c. 31) and (S. Paulinus *Epist. ad amandum*). But abuses arising, recourse was had to the provisions of the Canon law. The Council of