

the temporal subordinate. Let us take for example the old Puritans of New England, who founded the Massachusetts colony. They belonged, up to the time of their leaving England, to the English establishment. After they came to New England, they set up an ecclesiastical establishment for themselves. And what was their principle? What was their objection to remaining in England and members of the Anglican Church? It was, that the Church of England gave to the State, or temporal authority, jurisdiction in spiritual matters. The principle of their separation was precisely the independence and supremacy of the spiritual order. This they asserted; and that they might maintain it, they submitted to exile, and braved all the hardships of a new settlement, amidst merciless savages on a bleak and inhospitable coast.

And of the Church from which they separated, Cardinal Manning has this good word to say, in his essay on "Ultramontaniam and Christianity":—

"The Established Church of England affirms to this day, in its whole ecclesiastical law and by the teaching of its highest authorities, that the Church of Jesus Christ is a society separate in its spiritual constitution from all civil powers, and within its own sphere of doctrine and discipline supreme. In making this assertion, I shall not be misunderstood to mean that the Established Church has preserved its spiritual supremacy in doctrine and discipline."*

The old Scottish Covenanters separated from their brethren on the very principle we uphold, and the Free Kirk asserts with all its energy the incompetency of the State in spirituals, and the obligation of the State to conform to the teachings and precepts of the Church.

"It can hardly be necessary," says Cardinal Manning, "to trace the history of what are called the Free Churches of England. They came into existence by a refusal of the Royal Supremacy in reli-

* "Miscellanies," Vol. II., p. 176.