

In England, the necessity for nonconformity, arising from the entire subjection of the Church to the State, is very potent. It is nothing less than monstrous, that a Church of Jesus Christ should be bound hand and foot by the secular power; should be free to profess no doctrine, to offer no prayer, and to administer no discipline, except as prescribed by Act of Parliament or Order in Council. The Book of Common Prayer was moulded into its present form, the constitution of the church was fixed, and its subsequent administration has been directed by the Crown and Legislature, not by the body of Christ itself. The State has always taken care to keep the upper hand. Any inconvenient liberty taken by the Church has been promptly and harshly repressed.

Now, although it is true that State-Churchism in the Colonies, at least in these Colonies, never attained such a rampant growth as in the mother country, it must not be forgotten, that the Church itself made a desperate struggle to reproduce the entire Establishment system in every part of the British Empire; that it claimed exclusive endowments and supremacy over all other religious bodies; and only let go its hold upon the arm of the law when beaten away by the friends of religious equality on the one hand, and at last shaken off by the mother Church and mother State themselves, in Lord Westbury's judgment, on the other. Whether the Colonial Churches are yet to be entirely free, is not perfectly certain, for the required Imperial legislation has not taken place. Colenso flourishes his patent in the face of the whole Episcopate. But at all events, the mark of Caesar's sceptre is to be seen on every part of the system. The Church here inherits the Book with all its blemishes, as it has been made to suit Royal and Parliamentary demands. The declarations of Royal Supremacy cover a great deal more than the acknowledgment of the Queen as supreme judge in all causes in the courts respecting ecclesiastical persons and matters. The whole system is flavoured with the Church and State doctrine. When the best Churchmen are themselves ashamed of this, and are toiling to set themselves free, is it the time for those who have known liberty to return to the house of bondage?

We do not consider the question of the use of a Liturgy, so vital as many others. The Bible certainly does not prescribe one; neither does it positively forbid it. Yet the Bible unquestionably favours free prayer, nearly all its examples of prayer being strictly extemporaneous. Now, whatever may be abstractly possible in reference to some ideal liturgy, there is no doubt that *this* Anglican Liturgy, which alone is to be used in public service, discourages the cultivation and practice of Free Prayer. The minister is said indeed to be at liberty to pray as he will in the brief prayer preceding the sermon. But after an hour and a half of written service, what liberty is this? Free Prayer is *permitted* perhaps in certain by-ways, but it has no place of honor; it is under the ban; a man may observe every letter of the rubric, without offering a petition that is not put ready-made into his mouth. The Prayer-