

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.
United States and Europe—\$2.50.
Publisher & Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.
Editors—Rev. James T. Foley, R. A. A.
(Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.)

Associate Editor—H. F. Mackintosh.
Manager—Robert M. Burns.

Address business letters to the Manager.
Classified Advertising 15 cents per line.
Remittance must accompany the order.
Where Catholic Record box address is required
send 10 cents to prepay expense of postage
and replies.

Obituary and marriage notices cannot be
inserted except in the usual condensed form.
Each insertion 5 cents.

The Editor cannot be held responsible for
unsolicited manuscript. Every endeavor will
be made to return rejected contributions when
stamped addressed envelopes are enclosed.

The Catholic Record has been approved and
recommended by Archbishops Falconio and
MacRae, late Apostolic Delegates to Canada,
the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa,
and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London,
Hamilton, Peterborough and Ogdensburg,
N. Y., and the clergy throughout the
Dominion.

In St. John, N. B., single copies may be
purchased from Mrs. M. A. McGuire, 249 Main
St. and John J. Dwyer.

In Sydney, N. S., single copies may be
purchased at Murphy's Bookstore.
In Montreal, single copies may be purchased
from J. Milloy, 2181, Catherine St. West.

In Ottawa, Ont., single copies may be pur-
chased from J. W. O'Brien, 111 Nicholas
St. The following agents are authorized to
receive subscriptions and canvass for The
Catholic Record:

General Agents—M. J. Hagarty, Stephen Y.
James, George J. Guindon, Charles J.
McIntyre, Resident Agents—Miss Brie
Saunders, Sydney; E. O. de la Roche, Poudre
St. West, Vancouver; R. C. G. Chamberlin,
Ottawa West; Mrs. Geo. G. Smith, 2935 Mance
St., Montreal; J. W. O'Brien, 111 Nicholas
St., Montreal; Martin Ave., Elmwood, Winnipeg, Man.;
John P. O'Farrell, 96 Aberdeen St., Quebec
City.

LONDON, SATURDAY, APRIL 29, 1922

THE NATIONAL STATUS OF CANADA

Every Canadian is familiar with the assertion, made so frequently by our public men within the last few years, that Canada has made a distinct and important advance on the way to nationhood; indeed, that the Dominions are in all respects equal in status with the mother country; that Great Britain is merely first amongst equals. But, as we saw last week from the pronouncements of leading Dominion and British statesmen, there is "agreement in principle" only, the details have still to be worked out. And, as we have seen so often lately, the details are more important and more difficult to agree upon than the principle.

General Smuts, the Prime Minister of South Africa, was most outspoken and unequivocal when he said:

"The British Empire as it existed before the War has in fact ceased to exist as a result of the War. The Dominions have, in principle, authority and power not only in respect of their domestic questions but also of their international or foreign relations and the questions of peace or war which may affect them."

"If a War is to affect them they will have to declare it. If a Peace is to be made in respect of them they will have to sign it."

"The last vestige of anything in the nature of subordinate status in the relationship will have to disappear. These are not my boastful words. I quote the considered language of the present Under Secretary of State for the Colonies."

"The South African party is out for a sovereign status for South Africa."

As we have said, this pronouncement of the South African Premier is emphatic and unequivocal; there is no doubt as to the impression he meant to convey, and little as to the impression generally received. In the article we quoted from last week Sir Clifford Sifton thus summarizes the African Prime Minister's mighty statements:

"General Smuts's declaration is deliberate, studied, and categorical. He says in effect:

"(1) Independence of the Dominions have been achieved.

"(2) The Dominions are equal with the Mother Country.

"(3) The Dominion is not necessarily at war when England is at war. The Dominion is not at war until it declares war.

"(4) Conferences will be between Governments regarding civil matters of common interest.

"(5) There is no question of 'a voice' or 'consultation' or 'adequate representation' with respect to foreign policy. According to Smuts, the Dominion is supreme and independent in regard to all foreign policy and no closer union than the above will be tolerated."

The "voice," "consultation," and "adequate representation" here contrasted with the South African Premier's ringing declaration of South African sovereignty are, as will be seen by referring to last week's article, quotations from Sir Robert Borden and N. W. Rowell when the ex-Premier and his colleague were speaking on the self same subject as General Smuts.

"It is evident," as Sir Clifford remarks, "that there is a wide difference between the Canadian view of the external relations of Canada and the utterances of General Smuts regarding South Africa. Yet the actual status of Canada and South Africa must be the same."

And yet Lord Milner, ardent and uncompromising imperialist though he be, appears to take up a position much nearer to that of General Smuts than do our Canadian statesmen.

Premier Lloyd George, while apparently joining in the general chorus of exaltation of our new national status, asserts that it means a centralized control and a distribution of the burdens of Empire that would make our last state much worse than the first. Reread his statement. He assumes as an accomplished fact what had hitherto been but a pious aspiration of the more sanguine of Imperialists.

To quote Sir Clifford Sifton again: "This [Lloyd George's statement] is a remarkable and momentous declaration. It states definitely and categorically that all the Dominions have agreed that the foreign policy of the whole Empire (including the Dominions) should be handled through the British foreign office. It further states that the Dominions have become and are jointly responsible for this policy throughout the whole world, including, for example, Egypt and, if Egypt, then India."

"These remarks may be made respecting this declaration:

"In the first place, joint responsibility means moral, naval, military, and financial responsibility for any and every war in which the British foreign office or any other department of the British Government may involve Britain. These henceforth will not be merely British wars, but Empire wars, to which Canada shall be bound to contribute."

"In the second place, it may be definitely stated that no one ever assumed to commit Canada to such a policy, unless it was Mr. Meighen at the late conference in London. If he did so he has not reported the fact to the Canadian Parliament or to the Canadian people. If he did so, he did it without a vestige of authority from the Canadian Parliament or the Canadian people, who were, up to the date of Mr. Lloyd George's speech, in entire ignorance that any such proposals were being made or considered."

"In the third place, there is a very clear contradiction between Mr. Lloyd George's statement, upon the position of the Dominions and foreign affairs and the speech of General Smuts as above quoted."

"General Smuts in plain language tells the people of South Africa that the independence of South Africa has been achieved, that she is supreme in both internal and foreign affairs, that she is not at war until she declares war herself. Mr. Lloyd George says the Dominions have agreed to come in and direct foreign affairs for the whole Empire all over the world, in partnership with Great Britain, transacting the entire business through the British Foreign office and assuming joint responsibility thereof."

Referring to the recently proposed Franco-British treaty, the text of which had already been published, Sir Clifford writes:

"Consider this for a moment. This Treaty was negotiated by British representatives. No Dominion representative was present. The Dominions were not consulted nor were they a party to the negotiations. This is conclusively proven by the clause which provides that they are not bound until they separately adhere. The whole proceeding is in flat contradiction to Mr. Lloyd George's statement that hereafter foreign policy was to be under the joint control of Britain and the Dominions. Mr. Lloyd George would probably say that it was not practicable to consult the Dominions and give them a voice in the negotiations; possibly that is true. If so, it merely proves that the policy of joint control which he so eloquently announced above is impracticable and has broken down on the first trial. What we require is a policy that is not impracticable, and that will not break down."

And then he asks these very pertinent and pregnant questions:

"What then is the position of Canada? Shall she approve or not? If not, how will she stand in the event of war under the treaty? Will the fact that she has not adhered to the treaty make her a neutral and save her commerce from enemy depredations?"

"It would take a separate article to discuss that question."

Enough has now been said to indicate the necessity of Canada's constitutional relations being defined by law instead of by stump speeches, and to prove the truth of my remark that it was difficult to glean a correct idea of the true position from an examination of the utterances of our responsible statesmen."

The conclusion is absolutely justified. What we desire to add right here is that unless Canadians—average everyday Canadians—think over these things, study them, there will be no enlightened public opinion to guide those who may decide them for us. Indeed, it is quite possible that Canada may under the skilful pilotage of others be brought to accept conditions whose implications we shall not under-

stand. And despite all our boasting the "new national status" may turn out to be a retrograde step of the first magnitude in our national development.

CORPORATIONS, THEIR FAULTS AND THEIR GOOD POINTS

By THE OBSERVER

The corporation was necessary to the development of this new country. Individuals could not, acting singly, do the work that was to be done. Partnership, with unlimited liability of the partners was too dangerous; because it might at any time involve in ruin all the partners. The corporation, with personal liability limited by shares, made possible the accumulation of large sums, composed of small subscriptions, without exposing each small subscriber to the whole liability of the corporation's affairs.

One must bear in mind the fact that many of the corporation enterprises which have succeeded vastly, were not at all sure of success at their beginning. It is easy today to recognize the C. P. R. as a huge success, but it was not easy to see that success when it began. It is not hard to judge of events after they have happened. All seems clear after time has made it so.

One must bear in mind also that of all the corporation enterprises ever begun, a great majority have failed. In such cases of failure, labor has nearly always been paid; but the investors have usually lost all they subscribed. When the country was newer and less populated, the average hazard of corporation enterprises was higher than it now is. Even the mighty C. P. R. was regarded by many as a wild scheme. It was natural enough that men who risked much should require large inducements; and the inducements usually took the form of cheap stock. A company engaged in an enterprise which involves the holding of property; mines, railroads, usually issues both bonds and stock. The bonds are supposed to be secured by a mortgage of the corporation's property. It often turns out that that property when put up for sale does not bring the amount of the bonds. In that case, the stock, which is not secured, is, of course, of no value. But if the corporation prospers greatly, it pays the interest on its bonds to those who have bought them, and pays also a dividend on its stock.

Suppose the case of a corporation formed forty years ago to develop mines or build a railroad. It issued a certain number of bonds amounting to, say, a million dollars. These bonds it sold; giving a mortgage to secure them. Going to the public to sell those bonds, it found that the public were none too eager to buy. It had a further inducement to offer the reluctant public; that is, its common stock. Every corporation issues common stock. That stock is of no value unless the corporation earns enough to pay the interest on its bonds. The bonds come first.

Corporations have been accustomed to say to more or less reluctant purchasers of bonds: "If you will buy so much of these bonds, we will give you so much of the common stock as a bonus." Or, it may be, they offer the common stock at a very low figure. The prospective purchaser of bonds then says to himself: "Well, this corporation has a very uncertain future; it may succeed or fail; it is not unlikely to fail; its property may or may not bring the amount of the bonds if it comes to be sold at auction; but if I can get some of the common stock for nothing, or very cheap, then, if the corporation does succeed, my gains will be very great; so I'll take a chance."

It is obvious that this may, in a given case, be reasonable enough. It may, in another given case, be wholly unreasonable and indefensible. It depends on the risk that is taken and on the prospects of the particular corporation in question. It is obvious that in many cases this practice may be made the means of loading up the corporation with obligations upon stock for which it never really got anything. This is what is called "watered stock." Another practice is to give some persons large amounts of stock for their services to the corporation.

This practice may be reasonable and right; or it may not. Suppose the case of a man or men, from whom the new and struggling corporation has received great services; to whom it owes its start

and its triumph over early obstacles and set-backs; whom it is not able to pay adequately. If it gives them stock, and not too much stock, of a doubtful value at the time, in payment for such services, that is not necessarily unreasonable.

Years afterwards, when that particular company has prospered exceedingly, it is often pointed out that a large amount of its stock was originally "given away," that is to say the company did not get cash for it. But it is plain that there are other things that a new and struggling corporation needs besides cash.

The point I want to make is, that in the matters I have referred to, unscrupulous promoters of corporations, more eager to make money than to develop sound enterprises, have found a chance to load up the corporations with obligations which represent no cash and no real services.

There is another way of watering stock. A corporation promoter may have a friend who has a property which can be imagined to be needed by the corporation. Many cases have occurred in which a broken-down factory imagined to be necessary to the corporation's future, or to be a rival to its business, has been taken over by issuing to its owner a large amount of stock; upon which the corporation was thenceforward expected to earn dividends.

Such are some of the abuses of which the corporation is often guilty, and nothing has so much prejudiced public opinion against this form of commercial and industrial organization as the conviction that corporations are dishonestly inflated, and that wages might be higher and prices lower if the water were squeezed out of the stock.

There is a great deal of truth in this, as to some corporations; not as to all corporations. It is of little use to study only some of the phases and aspects of the corporation question. The question must be studied from all angles, or else no just conclusions can be reached.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

PRESIDENT HARDING's letter on Cardinal Gibbons, written in anticipation of the first anniversary of that prelate's death, deserves to be printed in letters of gold. "It is hard," he writes, "to realize that almost a year has passed since the death of Cardinal Gibbons. He was one of the men whom the Nation could ill spare, for his long and earnest service for both church and country had made him one of the most useful and wise counselors in a wide realm of public concerns. He possessed in a marked measure the qualities of the statesman as well as the churchman, and his influence was invariably exerted in favor of the best conception of America, its institutions and its destiny. Like others who have borne a somewhat extraordinary burden in the public service, I had learned to appreciate and rely upon his sincerity and breadth of vision in many matters of public concern, and his death was a very real loss. I am sure the same feeling was entertained throughout the Nation, regardless of creed. His liberal views had earned for him a high place in the esteem of all Christian citizens, and his services and leadership will not be forgotten." This spontaneous testimony from the Nation's official chief, to the uniform beneficence of the Cardinal's influence, whether as priest or as citizen, may be accepted as the judgment of thinking men of every class and creed.

THE RECENT death of the Irish peer, Lord Gosford, recalls the interesting period when his grandfather was Governor of the Canadas. That is a time beyond the memory of any now living. It goes back to days antedating responsible government and before the idea of a continent-wide Dominion had taken shape in the minds of men. But it was a period of growth and development none the less, and Lord Gosford's part in it, though necessarily of a conservative character, and not entirely in harmony with popular aspirations, was honorable and above board throughout.

ONE INTERESTING chapter in Lord Gosford's Canadian career was his friendship with Dr. Alexander Macdonell, first Bishop of Kingston. This friendship, intimate as it was in character, extended over the whole of the Governor's administration in Canada, and was con-

tinued after his return to England. It was indeed, under Lord Gosford's roof in Armagh that Bishop Macdonell spent his convalescence after the illness which had overtaken him during his visit to Ireland in the Fall of 1859—a convalescence, unhappily, which was, as it proved, but the prelude to a relapse in Scotland a few weeks later which terminated fatally.

WHILE THE nations are assembled in council at Genoa, seeking, if they may, a way to world-peace, the Superior General of the Sacramentine Fathers in Italy, Don Forino, is taking active measures to educate the nations to thoughts of peace and to set in motion the machinery of prayer to the same end. He has, in short, with the approval of the Holy See, established an association the object of which is the propagation of international peace by means of spiritual agencies.

THE NEW association is known as the *Lexus Perennis Pro Pace*, and one of the aims of the promoters is to erect a vast temple in which perpetual prayer will be offered for the peace of the world. This end is pursued by an ingenious device, which is published in the programme of the association. A clock dial is divided into twenty-four sections, in each section appearing an initial letter. Members throughout the world engage to pray for world-peace during the time that their initial appears on the dial, so that, apart from the actual devotions, which will go in in perpetuity in the church projected, it is hoped to have a body of associates in every part of the world who at every hour of the day are praying for the same intention.

APART FROM these purely devotional engagements the members of the association pledge themselves to use all their influence towards the elimination of domestic, social and political discord, and to propagate every right cause in a spirit of charity and mutual forbearance. The late Pope, we are told, enthusiastically endorsed the project, which fact of itself commends it to universal sympathy. If, however, we are to gauge the prospects of peace by the trend of current events, the nations seem yet a long way from the dispositions necessary to make it a reality.

AS AN aftermath to the Dante celebration at Ravenna the Grand Orient, the chief Masonic organization in Italy, head centre of all anticlerical propaganda, essayed to claim the great Florentine poet as one of the brethren, and even published a pamphlet, bracketing Dante with the unsavory Giordano Bruno as rebels against Church authority. One claim made in this pamphlet was that the Divine Comedy had been at a date given placed on the Index, but unfortunately for the credibility of the claim the Sacred Congregation of the Index was not in existence until long after that date, consequently the Index itself was non-existent. As matter of fact Dante's poem was not then or at any subsequent period so treated, and as all the world knows, it has ever been regarded as it is to-day as in entire harmony with Catholic theology, and the highest expression in poetry of the Christian ideal.

CARDINAL NEWMAN'S VISION OF IRELAND

"I look for a city less inland than that old sanctuary (Oxford), and a country closer upon the highway of the seas. I look towards a land both old and young; old in its Christianity, young in the promise of its future; a nation, which received grace before the Saxon came to Britain, and which has never quenched it; a Church, which comprehends in its history the rise and fall of Canterbury and York, which Augustine and Paulinus found and Pole and Fisher left behind them. I contemplate a people which has had a long night, and will have an inevitable day. I am turning my eyes towards a hundred years to come, and I dimly see the island I am gazing on, become the road of passage and union between two hemispheres, and the centre of the world. I see its inhabitants rival Belgium in population, France in vigor, and Spain in enthusiasm; and I see England taught by advancing years to exercise in its behalf that good sense which is her characteristic towards everyone else. The capital of that prosperous and hopeful land is situated in a beautiful bay and near a romantic region; and in it I see a flourishing University, which for a while had to struggle with fortune, but which, when our first founders

and servants were dead and gone, had successes far exceeding their anxieties. Thither, as to a sacred soil, the home of their fathers, and the fountain-head of their Christianity, students are flocking from East, West and South, from America and Australia and India, from Egypt and Asia Minor, with an ease and rapidity of locomotion not yet discovered, and last, though not least, from England,—all speaking one tongue, all owning one faith, all eager for one large true wisdom; and thence, when their stay is over, going back again to carry over all the earth 'peace and goodwill.'"

NO NON-MAN ANCESTRY

JESUIT COUNTERS DARWIN DOCTRINE WITH SCIENTIFIC DATA

Francis P. LeBuffe, S. J.,
Regent and Professor of Jurisprudence,
Fordham University School of Law

In an address delivered at the annual meeting of the American Bar Association, the Hon. James M. Beck, with rare insight and ability, diagnosed the present-day attitude thus: "In all former ages all that was in the past was presumptively true, and the burden was upon him who sought to change it. Today the human mind apparently regards the lessons of the past as presumptively false, and the burden is upon him who seeks to invoke them" (Reports of the American Bar Association, Vol. 46, 1921, p. 172.)

As the present writer is one of many thousands who still hold absolutely to the non-evolution of man, he has been more than amused, though not one whit surprised, to hear such hackneyed phrases, viz., that one who refuses to hold the evolution of man is "hopelessly brainless" (New York American), has a mind "armored and wrinkled in the old, old way" (New York Times), that to debate the essential soundness of the theory of evolution "is as preposterous as debating whether or not the earth is round" (New York Evening World).

Yet in face of all this mud throwing we make the categorical assertion that there is not a single scientific fact which proves that man has evolved from any preceding animal whatsoever, and we further assert that from a purely scientific viewpoint the evolution of man is one of the ranking hoaxes of all times. The "tyranny of names" is terrible, and everywhere we hear it said: "Why, everybody holds it." Well, everybody held once that the earth was flat and that the sun went around it. Does it follow that they were right? And isn't it a good thing to have a mind "armored and wrinkled in the old, old way" of demanding a scientific proof for a statement of physical fact? And isn't it an honor to be "hopelessly brainless," if to be "brainful" means to jettison all science and logic?

TWO POINTS TO START WITH

Before entering upon the matter of this paper the writer would make two points perfectly clear. The first one is that he intends to treat the matter in hand from a purely scientific point of view. Though a Catholic and a priest of the Jesuit Order, he will make no single mention of God, of religion, of morality, of the Bible, of Christianity, of Catholicity, though much might be said concerning the bearing of evolution on these great subjects. He mentions this because it is so often ignorantly objected, "Oh, you hold that because you are a Catholic." One might just as well say, "You hold two and two make four because you are a Catholic."

This position, moreover, is necessary because the evolutionists most frequently deny God, as traditionally and rationally understood, and one cannot meet them on common ground except in the realms of scientific, physical facts. Secondly, the writer for many reasons narrows the discussion, or rather accepts the discussion already narrowed, to the evolution of man and man only. Whether a mollusk ever evolved into a vertebrate is wholly beyond the purview of this paper. The question at issue is this and this only: Has man evolved from some non-man ancestor or was he always man from the beginning? The categorical answer of real science is absolute, in the words of the great Branco at the Fifth International Congress of Zoologists, Aug. 16, 1901: "On the subject of the ancestors of man, palaeontology tells us nothing—I know no ancestors of man." In like sense Virchow, renowned pathologist and anthropologist of his day and founder of cellular pathology, said at the Wiesbaden Congress of Naturalists: "Every positive advance which we have made in the study of prehistoric anthropology has removed us further than before from any proof of evolution to be found there. Man has not descended from the ape, nor has any ape-man existed." Remember, of course, that Branco and Virchow were outstanding specialists.

Let us then come immediately to our question and we shall proceed by taking up the major arguments advanced by the evolutionists. The first argument advanced is that of resemblance and may thus be stated: "Man and monkey are so alike that they must have come from the same stock," or "Similarity argues oneness of original parentage." Homology or corres-

pondence in internal structure and functional properties of organs is accepted and asserted as explicit proof of common descent. This is the fundamental, but assumed, principle that started all the discussion. But in the name of all logic and sound reasoning, even granting for the sake of argument that such resemblance exists, does it prove anything?

All that resemblance can evidence is resemblance. Let us take an example from external resemblance. Jack and Jim are perfect doubles. Are they necessarily of one parentage, i. e., twins? Or is it not adequately possible that Jack could have been born in Nome on Jan. 1, 1900, at 4 a. m., and Jim in Cape Town on the same day and at the same hour? Mere resemblance proves nothing. Resemblance may, indeed, create an initial presumption, for instance, that Jack and Jim are twins, it may create an initial presumption that man and animals are related, but it proves nothing. This initial presumption must be proved by facts extraneous to resemblance as such. As Pesch (Die grosse Weltatzeil II, p. 282) well says: "It must be observed, however, that it does not follow that because plants and animals exist in certain graded order, less perfect and more perfect, therefore one has evolved from the other. It is the fallacy of 'Post hoc, ergo propter hoc.' (You bought a brown fedora yesterday, and I bought one today, therefore I bought it because you bought it and derived it from the same source.)"

RESEMBLANCE EVIDENCES ONLY RESEMBLANCE

Yet this is what we continually hear—resemblance, resemblance, resemblance. Once and for all, granted all the resemblance wanted, what then? Resemblance evidences only resemblance. It proves nothing else by any known rules of right thinking. No one can deny that man has a body in many ways like the animal body. Certainly we are like animals and have like organs. If we and the animals have blood which is to be oxygenated, then we and the animals need an organ for this oxygenation—i. e., lungs. If we and the animals have a tissue system which is to be rejuvenated and repaired by a continually flowing blood stream, then we and the animals need an organ for pumping—i. e., a heart. If we and the animals suffer from catabolism, then we and the animals need similar organs of digestion, whereby food is ingested, digested and assimilated into the delivery blood stream to bring about repair—i. e., anabolism. But, as we shall see, this resemblance is shot through and through with essential dissimilarities, so that man and animal are physiologically and morphologically not univocal but analogous.

BUT THERE SUCH RESEMBLANCE?

First of all is there resemblance in gross outlines? Yes, if you take just one fast glance and cast no lingering look behind. But if you look hard, and scientists really ought to look hard, is there such likeness? As St. George Mivart pointed out in a book published exactly forty-eight years ago ("Man and Ape"), there is no species of ape that is really similar to man, but the orangutan is like him in one point, and the chimpanzee in another and the gorilla in another and so on, with alarming variations. On Pages 102 and ff. he lists the agreements and variations and says finally on Page 103: "But however near to ape a may be the body of man, whatever the kind or number of resemblances between them, it should always be borne in mind that it is to no one kind of ape that man has any special or exclusive affinities—that the resemblances between him and the lower forms are shared in by not very unequal proportions by different species," and, because of this, he says on Page 172: "It is manifest that man, the apes and the half-apes cannot be arranged in a single ascending series of which man is the term and culmination." Science, real science, says the same today.

So conscious, indeed, are up-to-date evolutionists of these variations that they have quite despaired of ever linking up man and monkey immediately and so have evolved from their inner consciousness a pre-man, pre-anthropoid stock—i. e., a pre-monkey, pre-man-stock, which stock was differentiated into the small monkey stock, the anthropoid ape stock and the human stock, which stock Osborne bases on "a hypothetical ancestor of this entire anthropoid group, founded on a jaw discovered in Egypt" (Amer. Museum of Natural History, Guide Leaflet No. 52, p. 5, and Men of the Old Stone Age, pp. 46 and 54.) And you ought to go to at once to the Museum and see in case No. 1 this tiny jaw on which so great a fabric is raised. "The mountains are in labor and there is brought forth a laughable mouse."

PROOFS VARIOUS AND VARYING

BUT was there ever such a pre-monkey, pre-man stock? Evolutionists, of course, say that there was and their proofs are various and varying and we shall rapidly sketch a few.

In replying to Bryan, Osborne speaking of the paleontological remains, said: "He? i. e., Darwin, could not have even dreamed of such a flood of proof and evidence." Has Mr. Osborne forgotten his own statement concerning his own prize exhibit, for the upkeep of which the people of New York are paying