

founded but one Church, which he was pleased to build on Peter, therefore any Church that does not recognise Peter as the foundation-stone is not the Church of Christ. This is plain. In connection with the keys of heaven, it may be stated, on the authority of Dr Gibbons, that in the ancient times, and particularly among the Hebrew people, keys were an emblem of jurisdiction. To say that a man had received the keys of a city was to say that he had been appointed its Governor. It must be remembered that to Peter alone, and to no other Apostle, Jesus solemnly said he would give the keys of heaven. Now, as the *true* Church must descend from the *true* Apostles, and as the Church of England, or Protestantism, was not known until about A.D. 1519, it seems to me very plain that the Church of Rome is the one Church founded by Jesus. The Roman Catholic Church has traditions proving its direct descent from St. Peter, and it has also an unbroken succession of Popes, St. Peter being the first Pope. Many Protestants allow this to be so, among them Bishop Short, an Anglican historian. He candidly admits that "the existence of the Church of England as a distinct body, and her final separation from Rome, may be dated from the period of Henry VIII's divorce from his lawful wife, Catharine of Arragon." It is a matter of common history that the Pope would not allow the divorce of the Queen. The licentious King then divorced himself and kingdom from the spiritual supremacy of the Pope. Some Protestants have said to me, "Oh, yes; we believe that the Roman Catholic Church is the one founded by Peter; but so many errors had crept in, that the Church became idolatrous, and good, true men had to separate from it." Now, this should sound blasphemous to those who believe in the Bible and the words of Jesus, for did he not say, "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." If Christians believe this, they must admit that it would be utterly impossible for the Church to fall into error. In St. John, xxi, 15-17, Jesus again makes Peter prominent before the other Apostles, by repeatedly saying to him, "Feed my lambs," "feed my sheep." It is very evident from this, that Jesus spoke of the lambs as representing the flock or Church; but by the sheep he meant the other Apostles, and priests. To the Apostles he assigned the power over the Church, but to Peter alone he gave absolute control over the Apostles as well as over the Church. An ordinary reader of the New Testament would certainly consider St. Paul as the prominent Apostle, yet he was not one of the twelve. In the 8th chapter Acts, we find Saul (afterwards St. Paul) one of the most bitter and unmerciful of the persecutors of the disciples. He was present, if not assisting, at the stoning of Stephen. In fact he seemed to be something like the Christian representation of the devil, "going about seeking whom he may devour." When Saul was converted and Jesus was said to have spoken to him, we see no mention of his being placed above Peter. No, he must have acknowledged, with the others, Peter as their Head after Jesus. When was Christianity first introduced into England, and by whom? No one is quite sure about it. Some say it cannot, at this distance of time, be exactly ascertained. Eusebius positively declares that it was by the Apostles and their disciples; Bishops Jewel and Stillingfleet, Dr. Cave, and others insist that it was by St. Paul; and Baronius states, on the authority of an ancient manuscript in the Vatican Library, that the gospel was planted in Britain by Simon Zelotes, the Apostle, and Joseph, of Arimathea; and that the latter came over A.D. 35, or about the twenty-first year of Tiberius, and died in this country. Dr. Gibbons, a Roman Catholic bishop, says that it was introduced by St. Augustine into England, by St. Patrick into Ireland, and by St. Pelagius into Scotland; but whoever it was that brought the religion of Jesus into England he could only have but a branch of the tree, of which St. Peter and a long line of Popes are still the trunk. The true Church must be Apostolical, must always teach the identical doctrines once delivered by the Apostles, and her ministers must derive their powers from the Apostles by an uninterrupted succession. No Church can be the *true* one whose doctrines differ from those of the Apostles, or whose ministers are unable to trace, by an unbroken chain, their authority to an Apostolic source. The Church, says St. Paul, is "built upon the foundations of the Apostles," Eph. ii 20. Hence St. Paul said to the Galatians, "Though an angel from heaven preach a gospel to you beside that which we have preached to you, let him

be anathema" (Gal. 1 8.) Not only is it required that ministers of the gospel should conform their teaching to the doctrine of the Apostles, but also that they should be ordained and commissioned by the Apostles or their legitimate successors. Even St. Paul himself, who was supposed to be miraculously called and instructed by God, had hands imposed on him (Acts viii 2 3), lest others should be tempted by his example and preach without Apostolic warrant. Then, to discover the Church of Christ, we have to inquire—1st, which Church teaches in their entirety those doctrines that were taught by the Apostles; 2nd, what ministers can trace back, in an unbroken chain, their missionary powers to the Apostles? The Catholic priests alone, says Dr. Gibbons, can trace their descent from the Apostles; the Catholic Church alone teaches the very doctrines taught by the Apostles. Then if the Bible is true *all* Protestants are under the ban of excommunication, their ministers have no right to administer the sacrament, no right to the office of teacher and guide to the people, no right to the Bible itself, for that book proves, if they believe it, that outside the pale of the Roman Catholic Church they are *Anathema Maronatha!* Roman Catholicism is a reformed Jewish religion; Church of England a reformed Roman Catholicism; Dissenters generally reformed Church of England. Some people say that the Protestant religion is less blood-thirsty than Roman Catholicism. I do not think so; there was not a pin to choose between them when each had power. History clearly shows this. I am not a Roman Catholic myself—never was, and never will be—but *truth is truth* and always will be truth. By-and-bye when the more enlightened religion, Spiritualism, has gained power, and is more understood, Protestants will be only too glad to throw the Bible nonsense back on the shoulders of the Roman Catholics. This *precious (?)* book in my opinion was compiled from many other books—a piece here and piece there, tacked together, arranged, doctored and improved to suit the times and ideas, by some *precious (?)* monks. Part of it is a history of the Jews—all very well in its way, but where the nonsense comes in is when they want to force it as the word of God on enlightened minds. It has been undergoing another doctoring lately, as though people are stupid enough to believe that the true revelation of God needed alteration and arrangement at the hands of man. The *real* word of God, as seen in all his wonderful works, does not require man's interpretation; it does not require interference, translation, &c. Bah! it is difficult to think that anyone in this enlightened 19th century could be blind enough to accept the Bible as God's revelation when any man can take any word and twist its meaning to suit *any* purpose. Think of the many, very many, phases of religious opinions. They are all founded on the Bible; and in truth each has as much reality as the other, for if you seek you may find a verse which, *properly* interpreted, will allow you to do *anything*, if the end justifies the means. Then as to infallible interpretation, the ministers of *each* Church (however much they may differ) are considered by their followers to preach the *true gospel*; in fact each considers himself an infallible interpreter of the word; yet all Protestants deny the infallibility of one man, the Pope of Rome, while at the same time each considers himself his own Pope. I was rather amused to hear that a number of Protestant ministers had assembled under the protecting wings of a Catholic priest during a recent lecture against Freethought given by him in Wanganui. How that worthy man must have laughed in his sleeve at the spectacle, when in his own heart he believed those ministers of an Apostate creed were just as much, even more so, under the Church's ban of excommunication than were the open champions of Freethought.

M.M.

Professor Huxley recently delivered his first address as President of the Royal Society. It was occupied with a review of the scientific history of the year. Perhaps the most remarkable passage relates to Mr. Gardiner's researches respecting the continuity of protoplasm through walls of vegetable cells, which means, says Professor Huxley, nothing less than an approach to a demonstration of the essential unity of plants and animals.