

bishopric of Canterbury, when, with his gloomy apprehensions of her future prospects, he is said to have exclaimed that "it was too late for him to try to support a falling Church". Yet the Protestant Church of England has survived the shock, and still continues after the lapse of 300 years from her foundation, and we cannot doubt that her prolonged existence is intended to be subservient to some important purposes of Providence in the preservation of true religion in the country.

Following, then, the order of your remarks, you proceed to lay down the position, in illustration of the intolerance of the Roman Catholic Church, that she denies the validity of Protestant Baptism—"she allows neither the validity of our Baptism, nor of our Orders, nor even of our Faith; we are treated simply as heathens". Now, my Lord, I confess that I am perfectly amazed at this statement. Are you really ignorant of the notorious fact, that the Catholic Church acknowledges the validity of Baptism duly administered, with the proper intention, by *any person whatever*—Catholic or Protestant—Clergyman or Layman—man or woman? Indeed, this principle is expressly asserted in the 1st Canon of the 4th Lateran Council, held in 1215, in which it is declared—"Sacramentum vero Baptismi . . . a quocumque rite collatum, proficit ad salutem."* And again, the Council of Trent itself has enacted the following Canon—"Si quis dixerit, Baptismum, qui etiam datur *ab hæreticis*, in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, cum intentione faciendi quod facit Ecclesia, non esse verum Baptismum: anathema sit."† But, my Lord, you seem to think that the Catholic Church has adopted the error of St. Cyprian and the African Bishops on this point, though it was rejected at

* Catalani SS. Concilia Œcum. Tom. III. p. 239.

† Concil. Trid. Sess. VII. (De Bapt.) Can. iv.