

or any one else's thesis. He gets into a dilemma too about this thesis, and quotes Webster's definition—"a position or proposition which a person advances and offers to maintain," &c. I agree with this definition, but I fail to see how a conclusion drawn from "a position," can be a thesis. What the Rev. gentleman would have me accept as the thesis of my sermon, viz.: "that there are certain marks of the true Church, which don't belong to the Catholic Church," is just the conclusion I draw by contrast from the position, "One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, distinguishing marks of the true Church." Again, he quotes from my sermon the following: "But what is meant by internal unity? It is not that all the members of the true Church should *think* exactly alike on every point, that is impossible, it is not desirable"—and from this he concludes that I teach that "the members of the Church of Christ are not bound to believe all the doctrines which have been taught by Christ." By the same mode of fallacious reasoning, and with equal propriety, he might have proved that I teach that there is no God, no hereafter, no such person as Rev. Father Molphy in Strathroy, and so on. If these are examples of the Rev. gentleman's logical powers when he is calm and fully recovered from the pain of defeat, I don't think a year under some one of our professors of logic would do him any harm. However, I will put, and answer a question or so, that may show the Rev. gentleman his position in relation to the above quotation. Do all the Fathers *think* exactly alike on every point? "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church." Do they all *think* alike on this point? He knows full well that they do not. They divide themselves into *three* different classes, and hold *three* distinct opinions of it. Do all the members of the Romish Councils *think* exactly alike on every point? Take for example *infallibility*. Do they all *think* alike on this point? Why, the Rev. gentleman knows that some place infallibility in the Pope—some in a general Council—and others in the Pope and Council united. From the above I will now give you a specimen of Rev. Father Molphy's reasoning. The Fathers did not *think* exactly alike on every point, therefore, both the Fathers and the members of the Councils taught that the members of Christ's Church are not bound to believe all the doctrines which have been taught by Christ. How does this look for logical reasoning? In my opinion the comparison the Rev. gentleman draws between my ignorance and that of a four year old child, could have been retained with propriety at home.

The Rev. gentleman proceeds to say that when we acknowledge the subordinate authority of the Governor General, we do not exclude the higher authority of the Queen. I agree with him here. But when he goes on to use this line of argument for the purpose of establishing the subordinate authority of the Pope in relation to God, I say stop. The Governor General has his authority by royal permission, the Pope has his by usurpation, and in direct opposition to the will of God. In my letter I asked the Rev. gentleman to prove from Scripture that Christ is only Head of the redeemed Church in heaven, and that the Pope is the head of the Church on earth, but this he could not do. In his usual way of getting over difficulties, he takes no notice of it. If he will attend I will now prove to him that Christ is Head of both the Church in heaven, and the Church on earth. "For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the Church: and he is the Saviour of the body. Therefore as the Church is subject unto Christ, so let