

cessor of St. Peter, and therefore *as such* has the *highest authority* given him by our Lord Himself, "not only over all churches but also *all the Princes of the earth.*" From this belief in the "*Supremacy of the Pope*"; Romanists are justly termed, by the peculiar name of "*Papists*"—or *children of the Pope*. Now, my Brethern, it requires no argument to prove to you that a religion which recognizes *no one on earth as superior to the Pope*, cannot recognize the *Queen's supremacy*; and, therefore, Papists holding this religion, cannot, *if faithful*, be loyal subjects of Victoria. The Scriptures (although by papists referred to in this matter) most signally fail in supporting the Pope's succession from Peter, or his inheriting the *infallible and supreme power* which he arrogates to himself. The *contrary is most fairly established*—that Peter had no power more than any other apostle—that he *was not* infallible; and from ecclesiastical history it can be further shown that the *supremacy of the Romish See* was *wholly unknown* for the *first six centuries*. In the *fourth* century, for example, all bishops were pronounced *equal*; and when in the *sixth* century the Bishop of Constantinople, was offered by the Emperor Mauritius the title of *Universal Bishop*; Gregory the Great, of Rome, burst out in *furious opposition* against this *title and authority*, and said that he who assumed this *universal jurisdiction* "*was the forerunner of Antichrist*"!! Strange language you will say, my Brethren, from the lips of one who, if we believe modern Romanists (or Papists) was a successor of St. Peter and inherited *as such* this *universal power and title*!

But the truth of the matter is simply that *as the city of Rome grew in importance, so did her Bishop*, until at last he *assumed* the *power and title* which now his votaries give him with *abject submission*—a *title and power* strongly advocated in the notorious decrees of the Papal Council of Trent, which bears the modern date of the *sixteenth* century.

But that Papists cannot be, (in adherence to their creed) *loyal* subjects, is not only clear from their *belief itself*; but is also shown from their *conduct* engraven on the pages of history. There we find that *wherever and whenever Romish power can*