

principle. The distribution of power may be unequal in three respects. It may be divided unequally among classes; it may be divided unequally among different portions of territory; or it may be divided unequally among individuals. Practically, the last proposition is only true of derived power; and of that it must always be true. In associations connected with pecuniary interests, in which property is the basis of the society, men are not unfrequently allowed to vote in proportion to the interest which they may hold in the property of the society. But such a principle is not applicable, and has never been applied, to political societies. Political power may be unequally divided among classes of men, or even among men collected in masses, which are separated from each other by territorial boundaries. But an inequality of votes among men of the same class and community, would be an innovation in politics. The Church has not thought proper to make that innovation.

The unequal distribution of power among communities separated by territorial lines may be produced by distributing it equally among unequal communities, or unequally among equal communities, or by adopting the principle of representation according to numbers, subject to some arbitrary limitations. The whole matter is intimately connected with the federative system, and will be best considered in that connection. We shall, therefore, leave that part of the subject for the present.

The unequal distribution of power among classes may be produced by dividing it equally among classes composed of unequal numbers, or by giving to one class powers, which are denied to others. It cannot be denied, that the Church has distributed power unequally among classes in both modes. Her classes are called orders, and are a part of her Divinely given Constitution. She is divided into the two great classes, or orders, of clergy and laity. The clergy again are divided into the three orders of bishops, priests, and deacons. Each of these three orders has its own peculiar powers, which the Church holds to be Divinely given, and which, therefore, cannot be changed. The existence of these orders is an unchangeable part of the Constitution of the Church which never can, therefore, become purely democratic. The powers of two of the three orders of clergy, the bishops and priests, include powers of government. Both

possess judicial authority, and the bishops legislative, as inherent parts of their respective offices. These the Church cannot take away, she can only interpose checks against their abuse.

In the legislative department, this is done by subjecting them to mutual checks, and both to the check of the necessity of the concurrence of the laity. By this means an unequal distribution of power is made, by an equal distribution of it among three unequal classes; since there must always be fewer priests than laymen, and fewer bishops than priests. But this arrangement cannot be changed; because the negatives of the bishops and presbyters are necessary to the protection of the privileges, which they, the minority, hold, and which they must hold, because they are Divinely given. The negative of the laity is necessary as a security that these privileges shall not be abused, to the prejudice of the great body of the Church. The Church, then, has, and must retain, a legislature in which several orders, that is, classes, counterbalance each other.

Yet she carries out this principle of mutual checks, in such a mode as to mitigate the evils which it might be feared would arise from the negative, which the less numerous classes possess on the action of the more numerous. No man can pass into the class of bishops except after an election, upon which the order of laymen have a distinct negative. No man can be elected a representative of the priests in the legislative council of the Church at large, without receiving a large number of lay votes. In many dioceses, the order of the laity have a direct negative on his election. In addition to this, the laity have a control over the conduct of each individual presbyter, arising from the fact, that if he is at the head of a congregation, he has been placed there by lay votes; if he be not, he can only be provided for by lay votes. Moreover, they are, every one of them, dependent for the comfort of their lives upon the good-will of the individual laymen with whom they may be in contact. Where the support of the minister is derived from subscriptions, his very subsistence is in the hands of the laity. Where it is derived from pew rents, he has an indirect interest in keeping the pews occupied. Upon the whole, the Church seems to have provided sufficient practical guarantees against the abuse of power by her privileged orders. They have been hitherto