

Price of Subscription—\$2.00 per annum.
THOMAS COFFEY, Editor and Publisher.
Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough, and Oshawa, and the clergy throughout the Dominion.
Subscribers changing residence will please give old as well as new address.
Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form.
Each insertion 50 cents.
News: Luke King, J. J. Neven, E. J. Brodick, and Miss Sara Hanley are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for THE CATHOLIC RECORD, Agent for Newfoundland, Mr. James Power of St. John. Agent for district of Nipissing, Mrs. M. Reynolds, New Liskeard.

LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION.
Apostolic Delegation
Ottawa, June 13th, 1905.
Mr. Thomas Coffey:
Dear Sir:—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper. I have noted with satisfaction that it is directed with intelligence and ability, and above all, that it is imbued with a strong Catholic spirit. It is especially welcome to me as a Catholic, and I am glad to see that it is so. I am sure that it will do more and more for the Catholic cause in this country. I am, therefore, recommending it to all Catholics, and wishing you success in your work, and best wishes for its continued success.
Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ,
JOSEPH, Archbishop of Ephesus,
Apostolic Delegation.

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA,
Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1900.
Mr. Thomas Coffey:
Dear Sir:—For some time past I have read your estimable paper, THE CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published. Its matter and form are both good, and it is a truly Catholic spirit pervades the whole. Therefore, with pleasure, I can recommend it to the faithful. Blessing you and wishing you success, believe me to remain,
Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ,
J. D. FALCONER, Arch. of Larissa,
Apost. Deleg.

LONDON, SATURDAY, APR. 20, 1907.

EDUCATION IN THE SOUTH.

An ex-governor of Alabama, writing in the North American Review, expresses himself with as much candor as strength upon the dangers of godless education as exemplified in the negro. Deportment of the whole colored race to some happy land of their own by means of airships, would, if it were practical, be in this gentleman's opinion, the best solution of a menacing problem. Education was expected to elevate the negro and render him a useful citizen. It has proved the very opposite. Teaching him to read has enticed him from the farm into the towns where he leads an idle life. "Books," says the ex-governor, "have given us a larger proportion of vagrants and a larger proportion of thieves as well." What is more threatening to good order is that the whole negro family stands to protect the criminal in such charges. It is the presence of these offences rather than of more serious crimes which prevents the cordial relations between the races. Seeing that the large number of negroes in town or country do little or no work they live upon the white people. To such an extent is this the case, the writer maintains, that every fourth workingman is bearing on his back one of these non-producers. The negroes must work or leave. Failing either of these alternatives the South is "on the verge of a dreadful upheaval." Where, then, since the present method of education has failed, does the remedy lie? It seems that thus far the negro teacher has been suffering with tendencies similar to others of his race, an inclination towards an admiration for idleness and theft. It is necessary, therefore, to have moral tests in the requirements of these teachers, and that they be required to teach moral lessons. Illiteracy is not the greatest evil. "No school," he concludes, "is properly taught from which the children can emerge without respect for constituted authority and human statutes to say nothing of the higher law."

Perhaps a half cent is better than no bread. Such moral lessons as are contained in statutes or taught by flag-flying or the infrequent action of authority in their regard, will never make the negro more self-respecting, more virtuous or more industrious. The means are not sufficient to attain the end. All that the argument shows is that education without religion and morality is worse than no education at all. The ex-governor is quite right as far as he goes. But he does not go half far enough; he stops at the first mile-stone. Education without religion and morality shows its evils more clearly amongst the colored people of the South than amongst its white advocates in the North. These evils in the latter case are even more grievous and more dangerous than in the former. But society supplements to a certain extent, and only to a certain extent, the deplorable want which the schools do not supply. In proportion as generation after generation graduate from the godless schools of the country, in the same proportion are the arteries of society poisoned with the bacteria of irreligion, grasping love of wealth and corrupting search for sensual pleasure. The halls of the North may be gilded palaces, whilst the resting places of similar seekers are in the South mere hovels. In both the evil is the same. In the South it appeals with stronger force to the white man for remedy and

correction. But the negro may well retort, let him who is without sin cast the first stone. The physician is surely not blind to these results of godless education of his own color and race in the North. Then let him cure himself. When we read these criticisms there is a satisfaction in the thought of the Church. How brave, how prudent, how zealous she is in regard to education. In season and out of season she has stood for religion and morality in all grades and classes of schools. Her loyal children make heroic sacrifices to carry out her wishes. When we find thoughtful men outside the Church acknowledging the evils of the contrary system, we feel, that sooner or later, all candid leaders of thought will approach more closely to the Catholic stand on the great question of education.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENT.

In fulfilment of the promise given last week we proceed to answer the questions sent us. The following is the first question: "Had Jesus Christ brothers and sisters? If not, what is meant by the texts? 'Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary, the brother of James and Joseph and Jude and Simon? are not also his sisters here with us?' (St. Mark vi. 3.) 'Is not this the carpenter's son? Is not his mother called Mary, and his brethren James and Joseph and Simon and Jude: and his sisters, are they not all with us?' (St. Matthew xiii. 55, 56)."

Let us take the four names in order, James, Joseph, Simon and Jude. None of these were brothers of our Lord according to nature. Nor had our Lord any sisters. St. Thomas calls attention to the fact that the term brother is used in four ways in Holy Scripture: nature, tribe, relationship or consanguinity and affection. The brethren of the Lord, he continues, in referring to these passages are so-called, not from nature, as if from the same mother, but according to relationship—in the same way as Lot who was really a son of Abraham's brother, Aran, is called Abraham's brother. The fathers are universal in their interpretation upon the subject. St. Jerome refutes Helvidius. St. Anselm also writes:

"The brethren of our Lord were not sons of the Blessed Virgin as the heresy of Helvidius maintains, nor are they the sons of St. Joseph by another wife as a few would have us think, but rather the sons of another Mary who is called the mother of James the Less and James and Jude." The terms, brothers and sisters, mean here, cousins. It may naturally be asked who these four, James, Joseph, Simon and Jude were. It may be asked whether these four were brethren strictly so called, born of the same father and mother? In the first place James and Joseph, or James and Jude, were sons of Mary. This is evident from St. Mat. xxvii. 56: "Among whom was Mary Magdalen and Mary the Mother of James and Joseph." As to the other two, Simon and Jude, some think they were brothers of James and Joseph, but only on the mother's side. They say that this Mary was first married to Alphaeus to whom she bore James and Joseph. This explains why James was called of Alphaeus, that is, her son. After Alphaeus died she married Cleophas to whom she bore Simon and Jude. This Mary was a cousin of the Blessed Virgin. This Cleophas was a brother of St. Joseph the Spouse of Our Lady. He is the same Cleophas to whom, with his companion, Christ made Himself known on the way to Emmaus. He was slain by the Jews in that very house of Emmaus, on account of his confession of Christ.

This question manifests very clearly the close communion between our Lord's divinity and our Lady's dignity. The attack which the question contains and which the answer is intended to refute directs its poisoned shaft against the miraculous conception of the Word-made-flesh. It would insinuate that He was conceived as other children. Further, not only would the Blessed Virgin be like all ordinary mothers in her motherhood of Christ, but she became by St. Joseph the mother of other children. Thus the attack is doubly insulting to the Blessed Virgin. Two great realities are to be preserved in our Blessed Lord, His humanity and His divinity. This question covertly attacks His divinity—without which the whole fabric of the Incarnation, the Redemption of mankind—and far beyond there, where rests the mystery of the Trinity in incomprehensible light love must be shattered to pieces. To build a creed upon a basis requires strength and breadth. To build doubt and denial upon particular texts here and there, and forced interpretations of even these few texts is too often the endeavor and work of higher critics, who, starting with a false assumption, continue an unsound syllogism and convince themselves by an ill-founded conclusion. The Incarnation rests surely upon stronger ground than it can be overturned by a narrow and

forced interpretation of the terms upon which we have given a brief explanation.

FRANCE BY A NEW LIGHT.

The Christian Guardian, ever ready with shifting views of things Catholic, threw the other day a new light upon the situation in France. Down in the office they had got hold of a copy of the Times. It contained some letter or other from one who signed himself "French Catholic." The fact that it was published in the Times, that eminent teacher and doctor of anti-Catholic prejudices, is quite sufficient to characterize its tone. This writer contrasting Leo XIII. and the present Holy Father, regards Leo as liberal and Pius X. as narrow and medieval. Anything medieval is to the Christian Guardian prehistoric. They were ages which cannot be appreciated by the Methodist organ. If pushed to it the Guardian would find a difficulty in explaining what it meant when speaking of Pius X. thus. If Pope did not differ from Pope in character and policy the Christian Guardian would be annoyed. It would find the Catholic Church dreadfully monotonous. The fact that Pius has brought confusion into the camp of the French Government is proof of his strength of character and singleness of purpose. This correspondent thinks that the Holy Father worked for a quarrel between Church and State in order to advance some way or other the interests of the exiled religious orders. That is all in the imagination. From the very start down to the present moment the quarrel has been the work of the French Government. It is useless to contradict either the Times or the Christian Guardian. They are equally careless about justice to Catholic questions, they are equally self-righteous, and both of them callous to correction. In the present instance they share the same hope, the establishment of a strong French national Church. Vain. With a united episcopacy it is impossible. Gallicanism is dead.

TORONTO AND ITS POPULARITY.

Why is Toronto unpopular? In assuming the fact we do Toronto no injustice. According to the Globe, it is generally admitted throughout the province, from the halls in Ottawa to the hamlets of country districts that Toronto is the most unpopular city in the Dominion. Managed by an Orange Lodge it is the centre of religious intolerance. It is the Belfast of Canada, and some of its governing body are intensifying the feeling! No doubt Toronto is benevolent, and deals out charity with an equal and generous heart. It does not make flesh of one and fish of another. Such has been, up to the present, the action of Toronto in regard to Catholic institutions. Long may it continue. It helps to atone for the other side, wherever Orangism can show its power, as in the case of the fire brigade and in situations at the disposal of subordinate organizations. There is one Catholic name on the whole city council. A Catholic name can, only with the greatest difficulty, be suggested to some of the patronage committees. Thus, whilst on the one hand Catholic institutions receive fair treatment, the lodge-room methods prevail against deserving individuals thereby perpetuating an intolerance unworthy of a large city. Toronto has outgrown itself. Its founders and pioneers never looked forward to this day. They gave the water front to the railways. They made the streets narrow so as to have more property. They planned the city for a hundred thousand inhabitants at most. They put a Derry lodge at every entrance. They have done their best to make and keep the city anti-Catholic. In their ambition to be "Toronto the good" they have posed until they themselves are weary. Sunday street cars, club drinking, bridge playing are fast silencing the claim of self-righteousness which used to be dinned into the neighbors' ears. To show the increasing wealth they have left the poor laborers to dwell in shacks whilst they have built palaces. Continuous quarrelling with the street railways in whose profits the city shares is only a part of the same narrow policy. Toronto is strong enough to shake from itself any or all of these weights which prevent its higher growth and broader expansion. All these old narrow ways are reasons why Toronto is not popular. However, notwithstanding, it is no mean city. When occasion requires, it rises to its dignity and shows its charity, its patriotism and its humanity.

JOHN REDMOND, leader of the Irish Party in the House of Commons, said recently in a speech in London:

"At last Ireland is coming to the end of her tribulations, Ireland's friends are in power and unless the Government proves itself guilty of treachery as great as the violation of the treaty of Limerick we are on the eve of an attempt to give us genuine control of Ireland's most important interests."

PRESBYTERIANISM AND THE CONFESSIONAL.

As it is a matter of much moment we desire to refer again to the sermon of the Rev. John McKay, Presbyterian minister, on the occasion of the induction of the Rev. W. J. Clark to the pastorate of St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church, Westmount, a suburb of Montreal, on Mar. 30. The extract from his sermon which attracted so much comment was as follows:

"I am rather surprised that an institution which exists at present in the Roman Catholic Church has never been introduced into the principles of our Church. It is the only true medium by which a pastor can be to his congregation what he ought to be. I refer to the confessional."

A few days after the delivery of the sermon in which this passage occurred the reverend gentleman supplied the press with a revised version. We have not, at the moment, the exact words, but, writing from memory, we think he still upheld the principle.

We quite agree with the reverend gentleman in regard to the benefit which is derived from the confessional by those who are committed to the spiritual charge of a pastor. The pastor should be to his flock the spiritual friend, adviser and father of those committed to his care. But he cannot fulfil these functions except through the medium of the confessional. He cannot know the spiritual needs of the souls confided to his care, unless he be made acquainted with the spiritual afflictions and temptations which trouble the souls whom he should nourish with the proper spiritual teachings, and furnish with the remedies needed for their special maladies of sin.

In addition to this, the pastor is the judge constituted by our divine Lord to reconcile the sinner to God the Father, from whom he has been separated by sin, for to him Christ has given the wonderful grace and authority implied in these words:

"Peace be to you. As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you. . . Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven them: and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained." (St. John xx., 22-23.)

This power of reconciliation of the sinner to God is further explained by the apostle St. Paul:

"God hath reconciled us to Himself by Christ: and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation. . . . He hath placed in us the word of reconciliation. For Christ, therefore, we are ambassadors, God, as it were, exhorting by us." (2 Cor. v. 18-20.)

It will be remarked from these passages of Holy Writ that the efficacy of the confession of sins arises out of the power conferred by Christ our Redeemer on His apostles and their lawful successors. It does not extend to those who have assumed to themselves this power, but is limited to those who were directly commissioned by Christ, "Who hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation" and "hath placed in us the word of reconciliation."

How, then, will the Presbyterian clergy become possessed of this power and authority, since they positively admit that they have not received it by continuous succession from the Apostles? St. Paul says of the office of the Christian priesthood:

"Neither doth any man take the honor to himself, but he that is called by God, as Aaron was. So Christ also did not glorify Himself that He might be made a High Priest, but he that said unto Him, 'Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten thee . . . and Thou art a priest forever according to the Order of Melchizedek.'"

It is a well known fact that Presbyterians do not claim for themselves any priesthood or ministerial office by virtue of Apostolic succession, and also that they deny that such succession exists in other Christian churches. With strange inconsistency, however, the "Form of Church Government" declares that:

"Every minister of the word is to be ordained by imposition of hands, and prayer, with fasting by those preaching presbyters to whom it doth belong."

But as it is also known that the first ministers of that denomination had not that succession which is here declared to be necessary, it was deemed wise to insert a clause covering this want of due ordination; for it is again stated that ordination is necessary, thus:

"No man ought to take upon him the office of a minister of the Word without a lawful calling. Ordination is always to be continued in the Church. Every minister of the Church is to be ordained," etc. (as above.)

But the exception is made for the starting of a Presbyterian ministry, as follows:

"In extraordinary cases, something extraordinary may be done until a settled order may be had, yet keeping as near as possible may be to the rule. There is at this time (as we humbly conceive) an extraordinary occasion for the present supply of ministers." (On Church Government in the Book of Confession of Faith.)

It will be seen that the Rev. Mr. McKay's proposition to introduce the confessional into Presbyterianism, has reference solely to a human institution,

which should take the place of the divinely instituted sacrament which exists in the Catholic Church, and which has existed from its original institution by Christ Himself, as implied in the power of forgiving sins which He conferred upon the pastors of His Church, according to the passages of Holy Scripture above quoted. Similar passages may be found in St. Matthew's Gospel xvi. 19: xviii. 18.

The Rev. Mr. McKay is, therefore, right so far as he means to say that the confessional is an institution which should be found in the Church of Christ, but he makes a mistake in supposing that it would be of any avail if established by a merely human authority. It would be a re-enactment of the rebellion of Core or (Korah) Dathan and Abiron, and their adherents, against Moses and Aaron, as described in Numbers xvi., maintaining that all the multitude of the children of Israel were equally priests with those whom God had chosen for this sacred office. The punishment inflicted upon these agitators is an example to all generations:

"The earth broke asunder under their feet, and opening her mouth devoured them with their tents and all their substance. And they went down alive into hell, the ground closing upon them, and they perished among the people. But all Israel that was standing round about fled at the cry of them that were perishing, saying: Lest perhaps the earth swallow us up also. And a fire coming out from the Lord, destroyed the two hundred, and fifty men that offered the incense."

We should here take notice also that the Rev. Mr. McKay appears to insinuate that in the Catholic Church also the confessional is quite a modern institution, wisely adopted, indeed, as a means of making the members of the congregation "what they ought to be," but still only a human device to this end, recently introduced, and existing therein "at present." It is proper, therefore, to adduce a few extracts from the early Fathers, who are the historians and doctors of the primitive Church of Christ in the Apostolic age and the ages immediately following the Apostolic age.

St. Clement of Rome who lived with the apostles, and of whom St. Paul says that "his name is in the book of life," (Phil. iv. 3.) thus speaks of confession: "For whatsoever things we have transgressed by any of the suggestions of the adversary, let us supplicate pardon. . . . For it is good for a man to confess his transgressions rather than to harden his heart, as the hearts of those were hardened who raised up sedition against Moses, the servant of God." (1 Clement to Corinthians, 52.)

Again:

"Nothing does He (the Lord) require of any one but that he make confession unto Him. For the chosen David says: I will confess unto the Lord, and it shall please Him."

Irenaeus, who wrote about A. D. 170, denounced the Valentinian heretics who corrupted Christian women, who, on their return to the Church, confessed this with their other sins. (Against heresies i. 6.)

Tertullian, who wrote in the second century, declares:

"The confession of sins lightens their burden, as much as their dissembling of them increases it; for confession savoureth of satisfaction, dissembling of stubbornness."

Origen, who wrote in the third century, A. D., describes at length how sins are to be forgiven through confession of sin made to the priest of the Lord by those who are not ashamed to declare their sins and to seek a remedy. (Homily 5.)

We might quote much more to the same purpose, but want of space prevents this. We shall, therefore, only remark further that it is clear that the Catholic practice has existed from the days of the Apostles.

NOT IRISH.

It is quite common to see distinctive Irish names figuring in the business of prize fighting. The impression, in consequence, prevails, that the sons of the Emerald Isle are prone to follow pursuits of the lower order. Oftentimes we see in the sporting page such names as "Kid O'Brien," "Young Murphy," "Jack Shea," etc., but these unlovely personages are frequently found to be Germans, Italians and Poles. The same holds good in police court circles. Some time since the Irish societies of New York, having made careful investigation, discovered that Italian criminals had been in the habit of giving Irish names when taken to the office of the chief of the police. In the last number of the Utica Globe a picture is given of "Terry Martin," a new aspirant for honors in the prize ring. Any one hearing the name would at once conclude that "Terry" was full-blooded Celt. But such is not the case, for a sketch of his career in the same paper gives his real name as Martin Martinson, and his native country Norway.

Life is good, and the highest life is God; and whenever man grows in knowledge, wisdom and strength, in faith, hope and love, he walks in the way of heaven.—Bishop Spalding.

A SWEET SINGER DEAD.

All Canada will mourn the death of Dr. W. H. Drummond, the genial, warm-hearted Irish Canadian, who was known as the "Poet of the Habitat." At a dinner given in Montreal on March 17th last, Dr. Drummond recited an original poem of his own composition. We have much pleasure in transferring it to our columns, showing, as it does, that the author's heart still beats warmly for his native land:

WE'RE IRISH YET.

What means this gathering to-night? What spirit moves along? The crowded hall, and torching light Each heart among the throng Awakes as tho' a trumpet blast Had sounded in their ears The recollections of the past The memories of the years!

O! 'tis the spirit of the West, The spirit of the Celt, The blood that spurs the alien breast, And every wrong has fell— And still, tho' far from fatherland, To tell ourselves with heart and hand, We're Irish yet! We're Irish yet!

And they, outside the Clan of Conn, Would never forget the Gael— The heart-strings of the Gael— His ear, tho' his alone can tell The soul that lies within, The music which he knows so well, The voice of Kith and Kin.

He hears the tales of old, old days, Of battle done by ford and hill, Of ancient Senech's martial lays, And rare unconquered still— It challenges with mother's pride And dreads him to forget That tho' he cross the ocean wide He's Irish yet! He's Irish yet!

His eyes may never see the blue Of Ireland's April sky, His ear may never listen to The song of lark on high; But deep within his Irish heart Are colors, dark and firm, No human hand can wrench apart, And the lark still sings for him.

We've bowed beneath the chastening rod, We've had our griefs and pains, But with them all, we still thank God, The blood is in our veins: The ancient Gael knows no fear, The stamp is on us set, And so, however foes may jeer, We're Irish yet! We're Irish yet!

A COMMON SENSE VIEW OF THE CONFESSIONAL.

The Rev. Father Fidelis (James Kent Stone), C. P., during a recent mission to non-Catholics in Philadelphia, said:

"Protestants so often think confession was invented by the priests in order to have the people under their thumbs—the 'poor priest ridden people.' What bunglers these priests must have been to put this practice on Catholics and forget to leave the burden of themselves! Even the Pope has to go down on his knees before some humble friar or monk, and if he makes a bad confession and doesn't repent of it and make a good one he is damned. Oh, if you only knew it, that burden of hearing confessions is the most terrible thing a priest has to do! Sitting day after day, week after week, year after year listening to tales of sorrow and crime and doing the marvelous work of loosing from sin!

There is another objection and I am almost ashamed to touch publicly upon it—the contrary against the immorality of the confessional. Well I was a Protestant once, my dear brethren but I thank God I never said anything of that kind. There is something so low, so incredibly vulgar not to say malicious, in respectable well educated and cultured ladies and gentlemen listening to the vile tales of so-called escaped nuns and unfrocked priests and friars!

"I am speaking to you as an honest convert. When I was going to my first confession, previous to being received into the Church, I stopped off at Newark to visit Bishop Bayley, afterwards Archbishop of Baltimore, himself a convert and former Episcopalian minister. I told him I was going to confession. You are going to the real thing now," he said; and I thought of that general confession I had so often read when a Protestant.

"We have done those things which we ought not to do, and we have left undone those things which we ought to have done and there is no health in us, etc. I thought of that sweet, familiar prayer. It is upon my mind now and it all comes back to me. How delightfully general that confession was! But now I had to go into my conscience and seek out the weeds of thirty years that had grown in the garden. When I got through I found it was the 'real thing,' and I felt so light and so happy that I might with a good run, have jumped across the Schuylkill river."

POKING FUN AT VILLETTE.

The President of a French organization known as the Committee of Militant Catholics has sent us some handbills which were distributed in Paris on the occasion of the appearance of the notorious Villette in the role of "Archbishop." Our French brothers in the faith very properly turn Villette's masquerading into ridicule. The handbills we have referred to contain comic verses, headed "The Schism of Chicago," which are intended to be sung to popular airs. Some of the verses deal with the seizure by the representatives of the law of the mitre and cross of the "Archbishop" for the payment of a long outstanding debt owed by the "Schismatic Pope of France."

In poking fun at Villette French Catholics adopt the best means of combatting him. There is no more effective way of destroying the influence of a person than by making him ridiculous. This is especially true in France where the people are so quick at recognizing and appreciating the comical. It looks as if "Archbishop" Villette is in a fair way of being laughed out of his self chosen "mission." It would not be surprising if he should turn up before long in the United States in his old swindling role of starting new churches for revenue only.—New York Freeman's Journal.

ATTACKS ON THE

BRITISH WEEKLY THOUGHT
DEALT WITH BY DOCT.
O. B. B.—"ROMAN
HUMAN REASON."

A sensational article heading appeared last Weekly, which we can challenge. Its aim opening sentence: "out more and more dispromising and relentless the legitimate exercise reason." This proposition by a series of bare assertions variety of the who pretty nearly the who trophy, and without at proof, it is easy reckless way, but not detail all the untruths involved, when a hundred are made in almost as take one of these at stance: "Ireland is a by English taxation of religion." It would or more to satisfaction a remark as this. The with similar remarks, then, is to deal with specimen.

THE FIRST GREAT AT

THE COUNCIL

"The Council w Italian Bishops, we knew Greek or Hebrew the writer knew that only thirty Bishops w total number of Bisho two hundred, and s suppose he means to deal with Scripture. he is in error. Th only thirty Bishops sion, they came flocki so that by the time o sion, which dealt wit were sixty Bishops i complains. "Traditio level with Scripture. fact stuffily reason to ask, how does he b to be God's Word ex Let him read the boo in the Protestant neither of the words Let him ask himself, sibly the writer does meaning of the word lies use it. In that form himself before Next he says, "Al Valgate were ratified tion." Perhaps he at this Council the c caused were first de for the Council in sp and this is the reason appear in the a of fact, if he had open the very first Bible and had read would find that inre pains had been unde century by Pope a succession of P produce a correct to He might know als the trouble to enqui SCHOLARS OF THE P

THE VULGAR

HIGHEST VALUE Let us turn now of vague and ununp "The last century l growth of fantastic ing miracles and by diligently encoura ities of the Church able to defend ones so indefinite as th the writer name som worship, etc., so what he is drivin can get a clue to little lower down w "IT IS PROBABLE HEAR MORE AB JOSEPH, THE SAC POSSIBLY THESE worships" cropped century. Is devot reasonable? He m know that St. Ann the Blessed Virgin name, it is known let that pass. We a mother, and that who was to enter relations with Alm human being before a saint. If th contrary to reason her? Similar re Joseph. His off might mean the tion to the Sacred being the product it is hundreds Gertrude, who liv dred years ago, ha tion to the Sacred the Church encour ships, she prompt Some years ago I introduce a devot Hands" of Our L only forbidden, an Index. Then, aga edifying miracles? edifying to him w the usual Protest Almighty God has sole since the l written.

IS THIS A "LEGIT

REASON" TO UPON GOD? The writer th made a strong "the plea of tr Church teaching proclamation of ception in the divided tradition, stultifies itself does not understo will enlighten hi if not explicitly, loved as belong Faith confided t some doctrines g doubted and cont the necessity of tradition is unan not define beca it, as, for instanc Assumption, wh But of the Immac did doubt, hence ing up the doubt