tia

th

th

ed

he

th

ta

aff

th

m

an

oa

hi

su

of

he

WO

Is

de

vis

ilh

tat

ac

on

the

St.

by

wh

fac

Cł

Su

hin

fai

to

eve

ing

yet

W

on

the

do

of

tho

sav

the

Ot

hea

actments of her Canon Law, of which time and space will only allow me to give one specimen. (Cranmer's Collection of Tenets extracted from the Canon Law):—"The Bishop of Rome may be judged of none but of God only; for although he neither regard his own salvation, nor no man's else, but draw down with himself innumerable people by heaps unto hell, yet may no mortal man in this world presume to reprehend him. Forasmuch as he is called God, he may be judged of no man, for God may be judged of no man." Take in connection with the above the immoral and impious lives of many of the Popes, such as Pope Alexander VI. and Cæsar Borgia, his illegitimate son; Pope Clement the Fifth; Pope Alexander the Third; Pope Pascal the Second, and others whose characters I may have occasion to review; take also the fact that John Tetzel was engaged by Leo X., during the years 1514, 1516, and 1517, to publish and to dispose of throughout Europe, plenary, absolution and indulgences, for any crime whatever, for ten shillings; take these with the multitude of her other imperfections, and say, if the Church of Rome has any claim to the "holiness" of which she boasts. Is she Catholic? If Catholic means universal—she is Catholic, but not for the elevation of men in moral and spiritual things. Is she Apostolical? Let her Popes, cardinals, bishops, priests, doctrines, ceremonies, angels, saints, images, relics and crucifixes tell whether she is or not. That the Church of Rome has ever been or

is now "One Holy, Catholic Church," I challenge any man to prove. In trying to prove that the Church of Rome recognizes the doctrine of "One Lord," the Rev. gentleman quotes a portion of the Nicene Creed, which was received by the members of the true Church in the Council of Nice, A. D. 325, ratified by the Council of Constantinople, A. D. 381, confirmed by the Council of Ephesus, A. D. 431, adopted by the Council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451, and which remains to-day as the Creed of various professing Christian Churches. But his Creed, which is in harmony with the Word of God, did not suit the requirements of the Church of Rome, and to it she added her own peculiar Creed, published to the world by a Bull of Pope Pius IV., on the 9th December, A. D. 1564. In quoting, the Rev. gentleman shows us the gold, but he conceals the dross attached. Why he does not quote the Creed of his Church. I leave the unprejudiced to judge. I could quote the whole of it, but a few quotations will shew its merits. "I. I most steadfastly admit and embrace apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions, and all other observances and constitutions of the same Church. II. I also admit the Holy Scripture, according to that sense which our Holy Mother, the Church, has held and does hold, to which it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scripture; nor will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers. III. I also profess, that there are truly and properly seven Sacraments of the new law, instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not all for every one; to wit, Baptism and so on. V. I profess, likewise, that in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead; and that in the most holy Sacraments of the Eucherist here a e truly, really, and substantially the body and the blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood; which conversion the Catholic Church calls transubstan-