

MY DEAR MR. GRAVELINE,—

Are you a Protestant or are you a Catholic?—some say you are the one, some say you are the other. For my own part I believe you to be a Catholic. You have a pew in our church, and by the same you profess Catholicism. On this account I beg leave to request your part for the support of the priest. You know our rules. If you are poor I do not ask anything. But you appear to me at the head of a family in respectable and easy circumstances. I believe it would be injustice not to count you among those who are able and who ought to contribute to the support of the priest.

It is true you offered me money at the time when I rendered my service to your wife. But it is not my custom to receive money which might seem to be payment for the sacraments which I administer. When any one pays me, he pays me only that which is called tithes. My services are for all, and I am never so happy as when I am well employed.

We read in the Gospel yesterday, these words of our Lord: "Go show yourself to the priest and offer your offering in testimony of your faith, according to that which is prescribed by Moses." St. Paul also tells us in one of his epistles that "the priest has a right to live by the altar."

You have too much honour and good sense not to feel the justice of the demand which I now address to you.

Your affectionate Pastor,  
DAUDET, Priest.

REPLY.

AMHERSTBURGH, Feb. 17, 1852.

REV. MR. DAUDET,—

Dear Sir,—I acknowledge the receipt of your letter. The object of it appears to me to be, not for the purpose of obtaining from me any money which you consider due to you, as in order that I may declare to you whether I am a Roman Catholic or a Protestant. I enclose in this letter the sum of \$3, being for the services you may have rendered to my family during the past year, but as to any future sums, after the declaration which I now make in this letter, you are not to expect them from me. If any of my family should solicit your services, you must look to them to whom that service is rendered, and not to me, as my mind is fully made up to renounce the Romish Church.

You are, no doubt, aware that I have long been enquiring after spiritual truth. I have been long perusing the Word of God, and I have been led to see that the doctrines and modes of worship in your church, do not correspond with the New Testament. I read in the Sacred Scriptures that "there is but one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus." (1 Tim. ii. 5.) But in the Romish system there is a great multiplicity of mediators. I find in the New Testament that very little is said about the Virgin Mary. I do not read of the Apostles or early Christians praying to her or worshipping her. Neither in the Acts of the Apostles, nor in any Epistles is she set forth in any prominent way, and much less as an object of homage or prayer. Nay, so far as I remember, I do not think her name is mentioned in the epistles of Paul or Peter, or James or John. But I find in your system, that she occupies as much attention, if not more, among worshippers than even Christ himself.—I cannot see how she could attend to the prayers of all people, in all parts of the world, unless she was possessed of the very attributes of Deity—unless she was omniscient and omnipotent—neither of which attributes does she or can she possess. I find that the rites and ceremonies—the works and penances—as well as the number of canonized saints, who are to act as mediators and intercessors, are in order to propitiate or reconcile God to us; whereas I read in my Bible, that instead of its being our work, to reconcile God, God is actually represented as beseeching us to be reconciled to Him, for he hath made Him, (Christ,) who knew no sin, to be sin

for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him. (2 Corinthians, iv.) I think that a great deal of what is done by the worshippers of your system, is virtually to take the work of Christ out of His hands—it is trying to do that which Christ only did, and which He alone could do. It is going about, as the Scripture says, to establish our own righteousness, instead of submitting to the righteousness which is by faith.

I consider that the simple and glorious plan of free grace, is to look to and rely alone on the merits of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has done to God's character and government, all that was necessary to vindicate and uphold them in all their requisition of glory, and at the same time enable Him, consistently with His perfections, to dispense pardon and grace to those that trust in Christ as the alone Saviour.

I find, too, that countries that are Protestant are more enlightened, more free, more enterprising, in a higher state of intellectual and moral progress than those that are under the Roman Catholic system.

For these and other reasons which I might enumerate, I have come to the determination, and I here declare that determination, to renounce the Romish system. You will henceforward, therefore, look on me simply as a follower of Christ—a Catholic, but not a Roman Catholic—a subject of King Jesus, but not of the Pope. I know that in taking this step I am exposing myself to many trials, but I have counted the cost. I remember the words of my Divine Master, who said: "He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me, and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me."—Matt. x. 37.

The question was once put to me, Why is it that Roman Catholics are so numerous? I replied that it was because when we are mere infants we are put into the hands of the priests to be dealt with by them, and are kept as much as possible from any researches after divine truth, except such as they may see fit to give. The mind is thus pre-occupied, prejudiced and cramped. I bless God, however, that I have been enabled to burst these fetters and enjoy liberty. I hope and pray that my family also may seek and enjoy the same religious freedom, and that my fellow-countrymen also may be freed from their present bondage, and obtain "the liberty wherewith Christ makes his people free."—Gal. v. 1.

Praying that you too may be led to see "the truth as it is in Jesus,"

Yours respectfully,

JOSEPH GRAVELINE.

P. S.—I may here state that the declaration I have now made to you, has not been given in the secrecy of the Confessional. I intend to give it publicly for the sake of my fellow-men, to lead them to enquiry.

J. G.

#### POPE RY.

A public attention has been and is concentrated on Popery, in its religious, ecclesiastical and political phases; and as we are entering on a struggle which is to eventuate in its success or destruction, we propose to enumerate a few of those claims and lying pretensions which it makes, as a great politico-ecclesiastical power. They will be found useful in assisting us to deliberate on many of those demands and discussions with which the journals are filled. Instead of observing any order, we take them as they occur, and content ourselves with only touching on the various points.

The Papacy claims universal temporal dominion over territories. Adrian IV., writing to Henry II. of England, says, that all lands "upon which the Sun of Righteousness hath shone, do belong to the patrimony of St Peter and of the Holy Roman Church."

The Papacy denies salvation out of its pale. "It is essential," says Boniface VIII., "to the salvation of every human being to be subject to the Roman Pontiff."

The Papacy claims supremacy over all men. "I cannot find," says Gregory VII., "that when the Lord confided to Peter the keys of heaven and hell, he made any exception in favor of kings." When Pius V. excommunicated Elizabeth, he declared the said Elizabeth deprived of the pretended right to the kingdom of England, and of all dominion, dignity and privilege whatsoever; and that all the nobility and subjects of the said realm who have sworn to her in any measure whatsoever, are for ever absolved from any such oaths and from all obligations of fidelity and allegiance. We likewise command all the nobility, subjects, and others above mentioned, that they do not presume to obey her orders, commands or laws for the future." Henry VIII. was by Paul III. "excommunicated, anathematized, cursed, and condemned to eternal damnation."

The reading of Scriptures by the laity was first prohibited in 1229. The Council of Trent still more emphatically denounced the "presumption." Leo XII. (in 1824) calls Bible societies "deadly pastures;" and the present Pius desires, to use his own words, "to join eagerly in their reprobation." For a Roman to possess a Bible is a misdemeanour punishable with imprisonment; and several young men were recently imprisoned for this crime. In Maynooth, it appears from a Parliamentary return, that a Bible is scarcely known, and no student is required to possess one. Peter Dens, the Filthy, is a far more important authority there. The teaching of the Papacy on the subject of oaths and solemn engagements is the most alarming, so far as human society is concerned, of any. Its other teachings may be equally or more presumptuous and blasphemous; but they are intelligible and patent. Here, however, we are lost among casuistries which destroy all confidence between man and man. A text-book at Maynooth, Bally's Theology, says, "A promissory oath obliges, unless a legitimate cause excuses." Let us see, then, what some of the legitimate causes are. "The hindering a greater good," is one. When the swearer finds, or thinks he finds, that the violation of his oath would tend to a greater good than its observance; or when the intention of the swearer is not what his lips express. Some instructive specimens of lawful or laudable evasions are given by Romish authorities. Alphonsus says, we may not only equivocate, but confirm the equivocation with an oath, "for a just cause." A priest may lawfully say on oath, "I do not know" of a crime, which has been confessed to him. The accused or a witness may swear that he is ignorant of a crime of which he is not ignorant, by understanding that he does not know it, "so as to give evidence concerning it." The Lateran Council declares that "those are not to be called oaths, but rather perjuries, which are taken contrary to ecclesiastical utility and the institution of the Fathers;" and the seraphic Thomas Aquinas gives us the reason why subjects are relieved of their allegiance to an excommunicated monarch, because "a heretic cannot govern the faithful." Urban VI. declares that "engagements of any kind, even when confirmed by oath, with persons guilty of schism, or heresy, though made before their apostacy, are in themselves rash, unlawful, and void." Nor are these mere abstractions. Not to multiply illustrations of the uses to which they have been turned, we may point to the cases of John Huss and Jerome of Prague, who consented to appear before the Council of Constance on the faith of a safe conduct; and who, in violation of the solemn pledge, were both burned alive. The Council considering that "no prejudices should arise to the Catholic faith or Church's jurisdiction," "such safe conduct notwithstanding."

Even mental reservations have been made the groundwork of an enormous superstructure of imposture. To quote from Dens a single dogma, it is said, "in every promissory oath, however absolutely made, certain tacit conditions are understood." For example, an adulteress can deny her guilt to her husband, if she has previously con-