

# INFAILLIBILITY OF THE POPE BEFORE THE TRIBUNAL OF REASON

Rev. Father Pardow, S.J., Deliverers a Brilliant Discourse in the Church of the Gesù.

The Teachings of the Church on the Subject Expounded in an Able and Convincing Manner.

REPORTED FOR THE TRUE WITNESS BY MR. J. C. HANLEY, MONTREAL.

Rev. Father Pardow, S.J., the eloquent preacher from Washington, delivered his closing sermon on Sunday, the 21st inst., at the Gesù, on Bleury street. There was an unusually large attendance present, every available portion of the sacred edifice being taken up long before the reverend preacher ascended the pulpit.

Previous to entering upon the subject of his discourse, Rev. Father Pardow referred to certain correspondence with which he had been favored, in the following terms:—

I have received, in the past week, some very friendly communications from those who are not of our faith. I would that time allowed me to explain more fully the points that have not been made sufficiently clear to them. Time, however, permits me only to refer to one point. In speaking of the Bible I have said that the Church, in the olden times, before the invention of printing, chained a Bible in every Cathedral Church, in order that the people who could not get copies of the Bible for themselves could be enabled to read it. My correspondent says: "Would it not be much better to have a free Bible in every house, as free as water, instead of having one here and there—a fountain with a chained cup?" And I answer: It would, unquestionably, be better, very much better; but my contention was, and is, that our Divine Lord and Saviour never intended that there should be a free Bible in every house before the invention of printing. If He had intended that His children should receive the life-giving waters of faith through the Bible fountain alone, it was absolutely necessary that He should have invented printing. He did not, and for 1400 years it was impossible for ordinary people to procure the Bible, however rapidly the Church was increasing the number of them by means of her cloisters and monks, giving their time to writing the Bible, letter after letter and page after page. Consequently, our Lord placed another fountain, namely, the fountain of His Church, and from this fountain the free water was transported to every house, but reason absolutely condemns the assertion that the Bible and the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, was the teaching of our Divine Lord. He gave no commission to His disciples to print Bibles, but He did give them a commission to teach. The moment printing was invented the Catholic Church availed itself at once of this powerful means of having the other fountain, viz. the fountain of the Scriptures in every house. That is all that time allows me to say about my correspondents, whom I thank for their friendliness and sincerity.

The subject for to-night is

**The Infallibility of the Pope Before the Tribunal of Reason.**

Not many months ago I was conversing with one of our separated brethren, and after we had gone over a good part of the field of controversy, he turned to me, suddenly and said: "But you must admit that, after all, your Church calls for a great deal of credulity on the part of its children, when it asks them to accept the doctrine of Papal Infallibility, by which you teach," he continued, "that, man though he is, he cannot sin, and that, therefore, practically, you make a man equal to God." "Mr. X.," I said (he was a graduate of a distinguished college, and a lawyer), "in your well-stocked library no doubt you have an English dictionary, and he pleaded guilty to that charge. I venture to assure," I continued, "that you have never opened your dictionary at the word 'Infallibility.' He pleaded guilty to that charge likewise. Now," I said, "please, when you go home, look into your dictionary; otherwise our discussion instead of theology, and when you have brushed up your definition, then come back and see me and we shall turn our attention from etymology to theology." He agreed.

I have often heard it said by those who are not of our faith: "I can admit everything your Church teaches with one exception, that is the Infallibility of the Pope; for my reason refuses to give in to your claim, but if you do away with the Infallibility of the Pope, then we may hope to unite with you, and have, once more, a united Christianity." I have been amazed, my dear brethren, amazed more than once, more amazed the more I think of it, that the people who make this great difficulty about the Infallibility of the Pope must, as Christians, admit that Infallibility has been conferred on many men without making them practically equal to God. For, I ask,—Did God Almighty write the Bible; and the answer is, He did not. He wrote the Ten Commandments on tables of stone, and that is all He wrote in the Old Testament. I ask my friends, secondly, when you read the Old Testament, are you reading the word of God? And the old time Protestantism before what is called the "higher criticism" appeared on the scene always answers,—Why, of course, in reading the Old Testament we

are reading the word of God. I put my third question,—You admit that God did not write a word? We do. You admit, however, that the words you are reading are the words of God? We do. Written by fallible men? By fallible men. Therefore, one of two things,—either it is possible to confer on fallible men the power of infallibility, or else when you read the Old Testament you are not sure that you are reading the word of God, because God, who, according to you, is the only one who can be infallible, did not write it.

AS REGARDS THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Did our Divine Lord and Saviour write the beautiful Gospels that we read? He did not, he wrote nothing; he wrote something, that is true. He wrote once with his finger on the floor of a Temple. We do not know what he wrote. When you read the New Testament, or the Gospel, are you reading the word of man or the word of God? And the old time Protestantism always answers, the word of God, of course, written by human, fallible men. Therefore again, one of two things,—either it is possible to confer on fallible men the gift of infallibility in the writing, or else, when you read the New Testament you are not sure that you are reading the word of God, and therefore, you cannot make an act of absolute faith. My dear friends, there can be no possible answer to this to the man who thinks. It cannot be done, and therefore, again, of advancing truths, the Agnostics and Infidels say to our separated Protestant friends:—You admit that the men who wrote the Gospel were fallible men? We do. And yet you say that it is certainly the word of God. And if it is the word of God, it can contain no error. This is illogical, and therefore it cannot be true, for anything that offends against the rules of reason, right reason, must be false. If God is the author of right reason, and were He to tell us of right reason, something that is false, He would contradict himself, and therefore, there would be no God. Now this is extremely serious, dear friends, extremely serious,—the question of our maintaining the truth of God; the question of our maintaining revelation, in the magnificent Old Testament, and in the magnificent New Testament, that we honor and love, and are willing to die for, and that the Catholic Church upholds in spite of all, as containing no error in its word of so-called "higher criticism." But in the Gospel as in the Old Testament, as it is the Word of God, there can be no error.

WE COME NOW TO THE POPE.

Remember that two of those who wrote the Gospel were not even Apostles. St. Luke was a Doctor, a physician, doctor of medicine, and St. Mark was a disciple, and yet we accept the Gospel of St. Luke, and the Gospel of St. Mark as we accept that of St. Matthew and St. John. Was St. Luke infallible? Are physicians always infallible? And was St. Mark infallible? Are disciples always infallible? Your answer must be,—that whilst they were writing the word of God they were infallible. Did they by that become equal to God; practically, Gods? Not at all. But when they had ceased being under the influence of the Holy Spirit in the writing, they were fallible men, as you and I, the Church teaches that, if the Lord had to protect these fallible men from error when they wrote, so if He wishes us to understand what He wrote by their fingers, he must protect the one who interprets what he writes. Did the Catholic Church ever ask anyone to believe that the Pope could not sin? Never. Can the Pope sin? He can. The Pope goes to confession every week. If he could not sin it would be absolute lying wrong for him to go to confession. Hence he is the first to admit that he is a sinner, as Peter was. Did the Catholic Church ever claim any of her children to admit that the Pope was always infallible? Never. Can the Pope therefore make a mistake? He can. What, then, becomes of this much disputed infallibility? It is so extremely simple that were I to speak only on the plain doctrine of the infallibility, the sermon would be over in ten minutes. It is so extremely clear and unanswerable. What does the Tribunal of Reason say about all this? It says: 1st. The power of infallibility may be conferred on men for a purpose and for a time, without making them Gods. Therefore, it is not against reason. The Tribunal of Reason says, 2ndly. That if the Lord wished you and me of to-day to accept His teaching because he taught it, then it is absolutely necessary that the one who interprets this teaching should be as infallible as those that wrote it, because the Bible is what the Bible means. Is that wrong? If I write a letter to my friends, my letter is what I mean by my letter. They may misunderstand me. We can never write so carefully that we shall not be misunderstood; then he writes again and asks me did I mean this, I say, no! You misunderstand my words. Here is what I mean, as plain as the words can make it. Now, our Divine Lord, dear brethren, came on earth to teach you and me just as well as He came to teach those who had the happiness of clustering around Him on the mountain and on the sea shore in Galilee 1800 years ago.

HE CAME TO ILLUMINE EVERY MAN, every human being coming into this world. Therefore, He was obliged to protect His words, and I call attention to the great want of logic and consistency in those of our separated brethren who refuse to accept the infallibility of the Pope. I understand that whereas, our Lord never said "write," yet, when they did write, that He so protected them that they wrote infallibly, what they meant. He did say "teach" and "teach all things whatsoever I have taught you," yet, this our separated brethren refuse to believe; that, whereas, He gave the power to teach and had given no command to write, when the men wrote they were infallible; when they taught they were not. The infallibility of the Pope is so extremely simple that I use a very trite comparison

giving him the power to teach until the end of time. It matters not to say that the distance separating him from England is very great. The distance is nothing; the wire is infallible. And so it matters nothing to say that the distance separating him from Christ is very great—1800 years or more. It matters not; the wire is infallible, and that gives the power and the consolation to the Christian soul that here in this corner of the world where we have the happiness of living that we can know just as truly as those who heard our Lord's words, and when they did not understand what He said, asked Him what He meant. You and I to-day can know just as truly as though we had listened to what the Lord taught. The doctrine of the Church thus far explained illustrates that text which I quoted the other night. How can a man preach unless he be sent? and I said, as I repeat, that if preaching means proposing a doctrine; if I were to come here and propose something to you to be accepted by you if you wished or rejected if you did not like it. Any man can preach, and I do not see really why any woman could not preach. But the teaching means that I am not to propose the doctrine, but that I am to impose it; that I am to come and preach with authority, telling the people that they are to accept the Trinity which I cannot prove, telling them that they are to accept the whole of the doctrine of the Sacrament of Baptism as a Divine regeneration, which I cannot prove; then I cannot preach unless I am sent. There must be some one to send me, and as there must be a bondsman for the people, so there must be a bondsman for the Church, and to define my illustration,—what does St. Paul mean when he says, "How could a man preach unless he be sent?" He simply means this:—That if I wish to send a message to my friends in some other part of the country, I must first communicate with the Central Office, and it is only then, when the proper connection is made, that my message is transferred from the Central Office and goes to my friends. How can I send a message otherwise? Impossible. So

EVERYONE THAT PREACHES IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH MUST BE SENT;

he must be approved of. He must know what he is going to teach, and the Bishops, who represent the Pope, must approve of his teaching, and if any man entering a Catholic pulpit were to rise up and preach something which is not in accordance with the catechism, it would be known in Rome in less than an hour and the word would come to this man that he cannot preach that doctrine, because it contradicts the word of God. Now, dear brethren, I have known in New York city this case:—I only speak of what I know—in which a minister was preaching what his Bishop disapproved of, and whereas the minister was called High Church and was far advancing towards Roman teaching; the Bishop was Low Church—low in the same denomination—Episcopalian, and that therefore the Bishop could not make him teach what the Bishop himself believed to be true. Hence, all the parishioners who came to him to speak about it said:—"I know what this present preacher, giving his name, Father S. and so, I know what he teaches, and I like his teaching, but how can I be assured of what his successor will teach?" "Why," said the Bishop, "no one can preach unless he be sent, but I, answered the Bishop, have not got the power, although he contradicts the teaching of the pulpit, I have not got the power to stop it." Is that Christianity? Then I renounce it all, for if the Lord has so deceived me that, whereas, he said no one can preach unless he be sent, here is a man who is teaching a doctrine contrary to the one who sends him to preach. The Infallibility of the Pope is therefore extremely simple. It does not make the Pope God; it does not require us to believe something against our reason. On the contrary the only solution of all doubts and difficulties in the matter of revelation is the Infallibility of the Pope, and therefore when our earnest and sincere separated brethren ask us to give up the Infallibility of the Pope and yet form one Church, they are asking us to give up

THE ONLY ANCHOR THAT KEEPS REVELATION, logically, remember, logically, in the world. There will be truths in the world and there are truths in various sects logically, but they are there no doubt, and they will stay for some time longer, but we must all have noticed that within the last 25 years all the lines have been drawn more sharply. Did those who really wished to believe and wish to be logical at the same time find that it is impossible to base their faith only on the Bible, and therefore, that they are gravitating steadily many of them towards Rome? The Infallibility, therefore, of the Pope does not ask me to sacrifice any claim whatever of my reason; if I did, then I would renounce the Pope, because I can

give him the power to teach until the end of time. It matters not to say that the distance separating him from England is very great. The distance is nothing; the wire is infallible. And so it matters nothing to say that the distance separating him from Christ is very great—1800 years or more. It matters not; the wire is infallible, and that gives the power and the consolation to the Christian soul that here in this corner of the world where we have the happiness of living that we can know just as truly as those who heard our Lord's words, and when they did not understand what He said, asked Him what He meant. You and I to-day can know just as truly as though we had listened to what the Lord taught. The doctrine of the Church thus far explained illustrates that text which I quoted the other night. How can a man preach unless he be sent? and I said, as I repeat, that if preaching means proposing a doctrine; if I were to come here and propose something to you to be accepted by you if you wished or rejected if you did not like it. Any man can preach, and I do not see really why any woman could not preach. But the teaching means that I am not to propose the doctrine, but that I am to impose it; that I am to come and preach with authority, telling the people that they are to accept the Trinity which I cannot prove, telling them that they are to accept the whole of the doctrine of the Sacrament of Baptism as a Divine regeneration, which I cannot prove; then I cannot preach unless I am sent. There must be some one to send me, and as there must be a bondsman for the people, so there must be a bondsman for the Church, and to define my illustration,—what does St. Paul mean when he says, "How could a man preach unless he be sent?" He simply means this:—That if I wish to send a message to my friends in some other part of the country, I must first communicate with the Central Office, and it is only then, when the proper connection is made, that my message is transferred from the Central Office and goes to my friends. How can I send a message otherwise? Impossible. So

NO POPE CAN MAKE THEM TRUE.

That is a very important part of my subject, and I ask you to follow closely. We are all keeping, dear brethren, as I said the other night, we are all keeping holy the Sunday, are we not? This is Sunday night; we should be keeping holy the Sabbath day, according to the Scriptures. Why should we not? We are all wrong. If one does not keep holy the Sabbath day according to the law mentioned in the book of Deuteronomy, let them fall on him. Are we afraid of these curses? We are not. Are we going against the written word of God? We are. Is there any declaration in the written word of God that the Sabbath has been revoked and replaced by the Sunday? There is none whatsoever. Why, then, are we doing it? Because the Church, the Infallible Church, has told us that the word of Christ has changed the day from Saturday to Sunday. Can you prove it? No. Can I? No. Therefore, it is absolutely illogical for any of our separated brethren to keep the Sunday and to refuse the Church. The human mind must be logical, or it sins. I do not say it is always a guilty sin. They may not think of it; there may be reason for it. The truth, then, may be contained in revelation without being contained in written revelation. The Lord Himself said, rather, St. John says: "Not one hundredth part of the things that the Lord did are written in the book, not one hundredth part. And our Divine Lord Himself tells us that during the forty days after His resurrection, He conversed about the Kingdom of God, and there are not twenty lines that tell us what He said in the Bible. Might He not have conversed of these things, and if He wished that these things should be handed down to us, was He not able to do it? If He could keep men only that wrote fallible men ignorant men; if He could keep them from error when they wrote, was it not possible for Him to

TRANSMIT THROUGH THE LIVING TRAIL

a truth that was never written? If it is not so, then all Christianity is a farce, because we are all going against God's Word, and we are not keeping holy the Sabbath day. There is, therefore, a clear distinction between defining a thing and creating a thing. And because we know the date when certain definitions of faith were proclaimed, remember, please, that that does not prove it is the date when they began to be believed. An example: It was only in the year 325 that the Council of Nice, at the great Council of Nice, declared—what do you suppose? The Divinity of Christ. In the year 325. So to argue, as some of those I refer to do argue, when a thing is defined it proves it only begins to be believed when it is defined. But the Church defined the Divinity of Christ only in the year 325, and therefore, again, it did not believe in the Divinity of Christ from the beginning, and that is only a new doctrine. Christ is not Divine. The Church defines the matter only when some dispute arises about it, and in the fourth century the disputes arose about the Divinity of Christ, and notice, please, dear brethren, that there are those who call themselves Christians to-day, there is quite a numerous sect calling themselves Christians, believing in the Bible, that reject the Divinity of Christ—the Unitarians, who believe only in one person, and that therefore, although they accept the Gospel, and they see there the wonderful things said of Christ; they say that is very true, that is the Son of God; so are you. I was conversing some time ago with a Professor of a College in Boston. In speaking about the Divinity of Christ, to know where to start from I said: "Sir, you believe it?" "Of course I do." "O," I said, "very well, then; we can start from that." But he said: "What do you mean exactly by

THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST?"

"I mean," said I, "just what I say—that He was God, equal to the Father." "No," he said, "you go too quick; I do not believe that; I believe that Christ was divine as you are divine." I said to him: "I, divine?" "Why, yes; you are teaching the people; that is a divine work." And I said: "That is all you believe of Christ?" "That is all," he says, "He is divine in that sense." And so, when the dispute came about the meaning of divine, bringing clearly before us the fact that the book cannot explain itself, and we have to go to the living teacher when you see divine. What do you mean? And that was all the dispute that arose in the fourth century. What does "divine" mean? and those who were beginning to leave the Church said: "We believe in Christ's Divinity; He is like His Father and like to His Father. The Church says, no! He is more than that; He is the self same substantially; Father to His Father—or substantially to the Father. They said, no; we refuse to admit that. And the Church arose in its might, and a great council of 318 Bishops was held, with the Pope at their head, and the definitions of the Council were only of law, when they were approved of by the

forms part of the primitive revelation, and then his power is passed, as regards definitions of faith. Another example:—Suppose there is a dispute about a necklace worn by Her Majesty the Queen. Someone says there are 50 magnificent diamonds in the necklace. Another one says, no, there are not more than 40 diamonds; the other gems are sapphires. How can the thing be settled? You and I cannot go to the Queen's jewels. You will not be allowed; they are protected; this is a special duty. What shall we do: how can we settle the question? Either it can never be settled by us, we shall never know, or, if we have some friends, we will ask the one who is charged with the custody of the jewels to look into the casket and tell us, and he opens it carefully, and says,—There are 50 diamonds. Did he put them there? Did the pronouncing of this thing that settles the dispute,—did that put the diamonds in the casket? He only verified the existence of these jewels in the casket. Is that against reason? Anything wrong in that? And that is all that the Pope does. Is it true that in the diadem of the Mother of God there is the jewel of immaculate conception from the very first instant of her conception or not? I do not know. Do you know? No. Can we find out? The only way to find out is to consult the one who is the custodian of the Deposit of Faith. God Himself addressed the Virgin Mother with the words: "Hail, full of grace." Does that mean immaculate conception? I could not say for certain that it does. It might, if the person was always full of grace; always, as the Lord said. That would mean, therefore, no sin at any time. Very true; you are reasoning now; you are reasoning about it. But is it a matter of faith? I will ask the custodian, and so we ask the Sovereign Pontiff if it is true that that pearl or gem is in the diadem of the Mother of God, that she was always pure. And he looks in the casket, the Deposit of Faith, and then he is going to teach the whole Church; the infallible power is back of him, and he says: "I declare in the name of Christ that that doctrine is part of the Deposit of Faith. It is inconsistent? It is consistency itself. We read, dear brethren, in the Acts of the Bible, Chap. 15th, something that gives us

Why? To have the same thing said in the same way, one would suppose that the Pope could find down some morning after breakfast and say to himself: "I have not defined anything lately." Suppose I define something this morning. What will it be? What will you have? What do you want me to define? The Pope can define as a matter of faith only what is contained in the Deposit of Revelation. And therefore, if the Pope were to make a new doctrine, which were not contained in Revelation, then he would give up his prerogative, and Christ would have failed, and the Church would have failed, and Christianity would be no more. You will tell me at once—I can almost see it on your faces—that there have been two doctrines added by the Catholic Church, Roman Church; two doctrines added of recent years. The Infallibility of the Pope is a recent definition and the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mother of God. It is true these definitions are recent, and therefore, if these definitions are not found in the Deposit of Faith, they cannot be true.

And approved, and imposed upon mankind, was that fettering the human mind? If we have to build a stately edifice according to the laws of gravitation—"why," I say to the architect, "you are a slave; you tell me that you have to build this church according to certain laws that you never made; thus your mind is fettered." "Well," he says, "if you wish me to build it without regard to these laws, I will build it provided you bear the expense." Dear brethren, I implore you, for God's sake, to think of it. I am indignant that the human mind of those who pride themselves on the mind should ever have made that accusation against the Church of God,—that Christ fettered the human mind when He said: "You must believe the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost are one God." Was that fettering the human mind? If He were not God it was; if He were God it was not, because I can admit that God's mind must be more capable than mine. Are we fettering our human minds because we regulate our timepieces by the standard time? Oh! it is childish. Truth can never fetter the human mind. Never will my mind be fettered until I am led away by error. Truth is my lawful liege, lord and sovereign; error is a tyrant, and only error takes possession of the mind, and then is the mind a slave.

Concluded on third page.

IRISH WORKHOUSE CRUELTY.

The British Medical Journal in a recent issue has a terrible arraignment of the brutalities practiced in Irish workhouses. It says: When our Commissioners inspected a number of Irish workhouses two years ago, nearly every report contained references to the barbarous treatment of young children in these institutions. That things have not much improved since then, a case that recently cropped up in the Banbridge Union goes to show. According to the report in the Banbridge Chronicle, the medical officer reported to the Board of Guardians that he had found an infant seven months old in his nursery with its arms broken, and in his opinion it had been broken for a fortnight. The master and matron were sent for. The former declared the nursery was not his department. The matron stated that though she went to the nursery daily she knew nothing about the accident, and only called the infirm nurse to see the infant because it was crying so much. In reply to further questions she stated that the children were in charge of an idiot woman, who was the only person she had to look after them, and that the child could not have got the injuries by falling out of the bed, because the beds were all on the floor.

THE LAWS OF GRAVITATION WERE DISCOVERED

and approved, and imposed upon mankind, was that fettering the human mind? If we have to build a stately edifice according to the laws of gravitation—"why," I say to the architect, "you are a slave; you tell me that you have to build this church according to certain laws that you never made; thus your mind is fettered." "Well," he says, "if you wish me to build it without regard to these laws, I will build it provided you bear the expense." Dear brethren, I implore you, for God's sake, to think of it. I am indignant that the human mind of those who pride themselves on the mind should ever have made that accusation against the Church of God,—that Christ fettered the human mind when He said: "You must believe the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost are one God." Was that fettering the human mind? If He were not God it was; if He were God it was not, because I can admit that God's mind must be more capable than mine. Are we fettering our human minds because we regulate our timepieces by the standard time? Oh! it is childish. Truth can never fetter the human mind. Never will my mind be fettered until I am led away by error. Truth is my lawful liege, lord and sovereign; error is a tyrant, and only error takes possession of the mind, and then is the mind a slave.

Concluded on third page.

SAVE THE BABY!

A mother will risk her own life many times over, to save her babe from the horrors of hydrophobia. There are graver perils from which a mother should protect and her child to the world's end, a rare, but thousands of children die daily because of the seeds of disease implanted in their little bodies before birth.

A woman may insure the health of her babe if she sees to it that she is strong and healthy in a womanly way during the period of gestation. Dr. Pierce's Favorite Prescription cures all weakness and disease of the delicate and important organs that sustain the burden of maternity. It makes them strong, healthy, vigorous and elastic. It banishes the squamous spells of the expectant period and makes baby's introduction to the world easy and nearly painless. It rids maternity of peril. It insures the newcomer's health and an ample supply of nourishment. It transforms sickly, nervous, fretful, dependent, childless women into healthy, happy, helpful, amiable wives and mothers. Over 90,000 women have testified to the benefits derived from this marvelous medicine. It does away with the necessity for the embarrassing examinations and local treatment upon which most physicians insist. It substitutes certainty for the doubtful treatment of obscure physicians, who seldom correctly diagnose these troubles. All medicine dealers sell it, and Dr. Pierce will cheerfully give free advice to ailing women who write him.

Scores of women who have been permanently cured of obstinate and dangerous diseases by this great medicine, have permitted their names, addresses, experiences and photographs to be printed in Dr. Pierce's Common Sense Medical Adviser. This book is free and contains 600 pages, telling the home-treatment for most diseases. Send for one-cent stamps, to cover mailing and customs only, for paper-covered copy. Cloth binding 50 cents. Address Dr. R. V. Pierce, Buffalo, N. Y.



EDUCATION.

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS COLLEGE

COR. NOTRE DAME and "Lace D'Ames" Square, Montreal.

One of the best organized Commercial Institutions in America. The course comprises: Book-keeping, Arithmetic, Writing, Correspondence, Commercial Law, Short-hand (in both languages), Sewing, English, French, pronunciation of all Civil Service examinations. Full training in Banking and Actual Business Practice. Experienced teachers in every department. Separate rooms for ladies. Studies, music, and recreation. Call. Write for Catalogue (300 pages) and prospectus. OAZA & HOLL, Principals.