

Northwest Review

THE ONLY CATHOLIC WEEKLY PUBLISHED IN ENGLISH BETWEEN LONDON (ONTARIO) AND THE PACIFIC COAST

VOL. XXI, No. 23.

WINNIPEG, SATURDAY, MARCH 18, 1905

\$2.00 per year
\$1.50 if paid in advance
Single Copies 5 cents

COMMENT

status, but is identical under which

Complaints having come to us about a paragraph in our issue of the 25th ult., as if it cast a slur upon the gentlemen at present administering the Government of this province, we beg to make an explanation. For the better understanding of this explanation we first reproduce the paragraph in question as it appears under the heading "Current Comment", in the 4th column of the first page of that issue.

Two days after the Telegram had trumpeted abroad the Hon. Robert Rogers's great hopes for the western extension of Manitoba, the same wise and prophetic journal deploras the fact that there will be no such extension in any direction. But it omits to give the reason thereof. The only obstacle to the territorial expansion of our province in its iniquitous and cruel school system. Not even the wildest corner of any unorganized territory will consent to saddle itself with such a tyranny. Manitoba must be content to remain small and mean so long as it maintains its small and mean school policy.

If, in the foregoing paragraph, we mentioned the name of the Hon. Robert Rogers, it was merely as an introduction to what we had to say, not as if he, or any other member of the present Manitoba Government, was responsible for the school act now in force in this province. In fact, by using the single word, "Manitoba," we distinctly excluded all present governmental responsibility, and we alluded to the "small and mean" campaign carried on throughout this province by our daily and weekly journals, by Protestant preachers of all shades of opinion, and by anti-Catholic lodges. In giving what we considered the real reason for the non-extension of the boundaries of this province, we were not writing from any special information received from any quarter, ecclesiastical or lay, we consulted no one as to what we should write, we argued purely and simply from the obvious difficulties of the case. Should this province be extended in any direction, will not the question immediately arise whether the Manitoba School Act should be extended to that new territory or not?

Throughout the quoted paragraph we clearly referred to the state of popular feeling, not to the dispositions of the present Provincial Government, which has always been remarkably just and fair to Catholics.

The following editorial paragraph from "The Casket" has the true Catholic ring about it, completely free from either Conservative or Liberal bias.

"We read Sir Wilfrid Laurier's speech introducing the Autonomy Bill, with a return of the admiration which we often felt for him as a public man, before his attitude on the Manitoba School Question compelled us to take sides against him. But when we turned to another column, and saw the 'Globe' taking the unprecedented course of flatly contradicting its Leader's statement, that the British North America Act required the continuance of the Separate School System in the New Provinces about to be formed, we could not help wondering whether the Government is preparing for itself a way of escape from a storm similar to that which overthrew the Conservative party in 1896. If our fears prove groundless, if Sir Wilfrid and his administration stand firmly by the school policy he has outlined, and steadily refuse to accept any amendments which will neutralize that policy, we shall praise him as warmly as we blamed him in 1896. Not for having done a favour to our co-religionists in the North West; it is no favour but their constitutional rights that they ask; for not having done anything more than his plain duty as Sir Charles Tupper did it in

1896. But to do one's duty in the face of all the bigots and secularists of Canada requires courage of a high order and deserves the same praise now which we gave it then. We hope Mr. Borden will stand shoulder to shoulder with Sir Wilfrid Laurier on this occasion, as the latter should have stood with Sir Charles Tupper in the matter of the Manitoba School Question. If he does not do this we shall have the same censure for Mr. Borden now, as we had for Mr. Laurier in 1896."

No sincere Christian can read the following dispatch without realizing how the plea of "no harm", commonly urged in defence of dangerous amusements and immodest dress, becomes futile and flimsy when once the soul gets a grip on spiritual things.

Dixon, Ill., March 12.—After Evangelist William A. Sunday, a former baseball player, preached a sermon on impure amusements at the tabernacle last night, hundreds of persons went forward and publicly renounced dances and progressive card games. Society women have also announced an intention of foregoing décolleté costumes. Nearly 4,000 persons heard the address and more than 3,000 others clamored for admittance. Gamblers have broken their tables, burned paraphernalia and turned the gambling rooms into places of worship.

The March "McClure's Magazine" contains a luminous and most interesting summary of the triumphs of "Modern Surgery" by Samuel Hopkins Adams. To anyone that remembers how, ten years ago, the great body of surgeons were seized with a craze for operating so boldly and radically that one of the contributors to a medical journal spoke of it as a "highway robbery of the abdomen," it is extremely comforting to learn that the operator of to-day "excises the disease instead of the organ, performing not as much as he may, but as little as he can. This is the touchstone of modern surgery: to save not life alone, but the structure of the human body. Its watchword is conservation."

While not impugning the general theory of evolution considered as an explanation of the origin of some special species, Mr. Edwin V. O'Hara, in the March "Catholic World", proves, by the testimony of contemporary biologists, that Darwin's much-lauded theory of natural selection is being rejected on all sides. He quotes Merz's "History of European Thought in the Nineteenth Century," published in 1903, as saying: "Although natural selection is a definite formula which allows us to understand and clearly define one of the many factors which are at work in the development, in the genesis and growth, of living beings, it is only one. It is not a prime mover. . . it is a check upon the over-luxuriance of other existing forces of production and development." It is, therefore, no more the main cause of evolution than an automatic brake is the cause of the motion of a railway train. O. F. Cook, in an address before the Biological Society of Washington, March 19, 1904, said: "By preventing motion in one direction selection may be said of course to cause advance in another; but it is apparent that this capability is negative and passive, or a mere figure of speech. Selection. . . is no more the cause of the developmental progress of the species than the turns of the road are the motive power of the vehicle." Professor Koken, of Tuebingen, states that "the purely paleontological method has separated us from Darwin to an extent that could not have been considered possible during the first decades after his work appeared." According to Hertwig natural selection, far from being a scientific explanation of evolution, is a "very vague" formula which gives a "mere shadow of explanation," and notwithstanding which, even eminent men of science "know nothing" of the actual cause of a particular transformation. Professor Dastre, of the Sorbonne, Paris, writing in the "Revue des Deux-Mondes", for July 1,

1903, has this to say: "It may be noted that natural selection is not a single hypothesis; it is a linking together of three hypotheses. If we separate the links of this chain, we can show that not one of them will stand test. The first hypothesis is that of the advantage in the struggle for existence which is given to an animal by the possession of small adaptive variations; the second is that of a preservation, by transmission, of this acquired character; the third is the progress, always in the same direction, of these profitable variations, which, accumulating, finally create a specific character. None of these hypotheses will support a searching examination." Further on, Professor Dastre says: "Now it appears that while Darwin succeeded in establishing the idea of the continuity of living forms by means of generation—that is to say, transformism—he was much less successful as regards the means which he proposed. To speak plainly, he failed. There are but few naturalists at the present time who attribute to natural selection any role whatever in the filiation of species."

At the same time as the foregoing article, there comes to us in the "Scientific American" of the 4th inst., a confirmation of this denial of natural selection. Dr. Sanderson Christison, writing about "Curious fishes of the deep sea", says: "It appears that many surface-water species stray into the deep sea; and while the shift from one environment to the other is necessarily through a graded course, it is a mystery why any should ever have remained under such unfavorable conditions. Such a naturalization would seem to be a reversal of the most natural kind of selection, and there appears to be no theory to account for it." He even goes so far as to call in question the universality of evolution even among the lower orders of marine animals. Speaking of the bottom of the deep sea, he says: "As if to demonstrate the limited and circumscribed influence of environment, we here also find crabs, prawns, crayfish, shrimps, lobsters, mollusks, starfishes, sea-urchins, corals, sponges, protozoa, etc., which are not only identical in all essentials with shallow-water specimens, but also with specimens of the remotest geologic showing."

The following short sketch of a deeply earnest and most significant address by a medical practitioner of the highest repute was tucked away in the "Local Notes" of last Monday's Free Press. Dr. Halpenny's dispassionate arraignment of the public schools, in which he himself was a successful teacher, is singularly opportune at the present juncture. It will serve as a terrible warning to Catholic parents who, allured by the brilliant accessories of those schools, may have overlooked the moral pitfalls with which they are honeycombed, and from which the Catholic school, with its constant safeguards of purity and its continual exhortations to frequent confession, the only effectual preservative against the bondage of youthful lusts, is happily free. This is the paragraph which deserves to be emphasized by editorial comment.

Dr. J. H. Halpenny, former medical superintendent of Winnipeg general hospital, addressed the Y.M.C.A. boys Friday night on the subject of personal purity. He first presented in his entertaining manner the story of great progress of the old Romans, which was due to their proper living, and then traced their downfall as the result of sensualism. He warned the boys against associating with companions of vicious habits, and the use of vile language. He said that he had seen the evils growing from school associations during his experience as a teacher, and was sorry to say that the public schools were one of the chief factors in spreading evil influences among boys. Another of the agents leading to the same end was intoxicating liquor. He warned the boys that they must reap what they sowed.

It will be observed that, although Dr. Halpenny places the public schools and intemperance among the evil influences against which he warned the Y.M.C.A. boys, he views the former as "one of the chief factors in spreading" the evil, while intemperance is only "another of the agents leading to the same end." A terrible arraignment indeed!

Unreflecting persons, hearing the noise made by the Orange lodges over the school clause in the Autonomy Bill, are apt to forget that it is "all cry and no wool." The fanatical clamor is utterly devoid of any real reason. It is all made up of words wrested from their obvious meaning. The shouters vociferate "equal rights", when they really mean the right to Protestantize Catholics and ride roughshod over Catholic rights. They shriek of "civil and religious liberty," not for others but only for themselves. No decent Protestant is influenced by such a senseless outcry. Why, then, should he fear lest his brother Protestant, who is not a L.O.L. member, be swayed thereby? Let the bigots yell. The days are past when they could, as in Ireland in the thirties, maim, burn and kill with impunity. And for them there is no middle course. Intellectual weapons they cannot use for the simple reason that they have no brains. But they are mortally afraid of those who have. They want to stop Catholic teaching because they know it to be irresistible in its influence over clear and logical minds.

The following letter appeared in the Free Press of the 13th inst.

To the Editor of the Free Press,
Sir.—In your issue of a recent date I notice a communication from H. T. McPhillips, in which the following statement is made: "At no time in the Northwest or in Manitoba or in any part of Canada was a Protestant compelled to pay taxes to the support of separate schools." I beg to differ from this, as I am a Protestant and have paid taxes for the past sixteen years, very much against my will, to the Roman Catholic separate school at Lebret, in the Northwest Territories.

S. CRUTHERS.
Manitou, March 6, 1905.

Promptly that same day, the 13th, the Very Rev. Father Magnan, Provincial of the Oblates, registered in the columns of the same paper this courteous but categorical contradiction:

To the Editor of the Free Press.

Sir.—As I have been a resident of Lebret, N.W.T., for nearly twenty years, and actively engaged in school work during that time, I can safely speak on that matter.

I beg, therefore, to say that Mr. S. Cruthers (however much I dislike contradicting my old friend) in his correspondence of the 13th, makes an erroneous statement when he says he "paid taxes to the Roman Catholic separate school at Lebret, N.W.T." No such "separate" school did or does exist there. Protestants and Catholics are on the same footing for the use and management of the school, Protestants being eligible, and one actually elected trustee. Hence the assertion of Mr. McPhillips holds good.

J. P. MAGNAN.
St. Mary's Church, March 13.

The Toronto "News" is mistaken when it calls our recent appeal to all Catholics, Conservative and Liberal alike, to strengthen Sir Wilfrid Laurier's hands on the school question, "a very mischievous form of agitation," which will tend to marshal Protestants in a solid phalanx on the opposite side. There is little or no danger of that, simply because, despite the general opposition, in any case, of most Protestant clergymen and all Protestant secret societies, there always remains a large body of independent Protestant electors who are capable of appreciating the reasons given by the Catholic body and who are not the slaves of party cries.

Besides, the system we recommend, viz., union of all Catholics on religious questions only, has worked very satisfactorily in Germany for the last thirty years, and Germany is, surely, as militantly Protestant as any part of the Dominion. The German Centrum is always ready to side with any party that it deems right on any other than Catholic questions, and so wise has been its general policy that not a few Protestants have joined it, for they find in it—to adapt Newman's famous words—"a serviceable bulwark against errors more fundamental than their own."

The Tribune's daily farrago of quotations from enemies of Catholic schools seldom contains anything definite nor anything worthy of comment, the most of it being rant and balderdash. But in last Tuesday's issue the Rev. R. G. McBeth, a native of Manitoba, makes a statement which one can immediately nail as untrue. "The curriculum of the Roman Catholic schools in Manitoba," he writes, "showed so little that was calculated to fit the young for the active struggle of life that hosts of parents in the Church braved its wrath and sent their children elsewhere, rather than have them handicapped." It is hard to believe that Mr. McBeth, having lived here at the time—he speaks of the Catholic schools before 1890—could have made so false a statement through mere ignorance. The plain and undeniable fact is that, before 1890, there were more Protestants sent preferably by their parents to Catholic schools than there were Catholics attending Protestant schools, and most of these latter took refuge in the Protestant schools because they would no longer be tolerated in the others.

Owing to Mr. M. Scott Van Koughnet's historic name, his first letter was calculated to mislead the public as to the nature of the schools we seek to have guaranteed in the constitutions of the new provinces. What we want is schools where Catholics of all nationalities can in conscience send their children to have them taught, together with the government's programme of secular knowledge, the truths of their religion. What Mr. Van Koughnet says about the French language or French influence in these schools is utterly foundationless. He ought to know that these schools are under the immediate jurisdiction and inspection of the provincial authorities, and that, according to the existing law all schools shall be taught in the English language, although the law allows the use of French or other languages in a primary course. There is, therefore, no question of race or language in the measure now before Parliament, but a question affecting the vital interests of religion. In proportion to our regret at seeing Mr. Van Koughnet, in his first letter, apparently lend the benefit of his name, as a Catholic, to those who are opposed to the Catholic education of Catholic children, is our present satisfaction in seeing him, in his second letter, explain away his first apparent attitude towards Catholic schools.

Clerical News.

Dr. O'Reilly, the Archbishop of Adelaide, and Metropolitan of South Australia, who is on his way to Rome, possesses an accomplishment unusual in an archbishop. He can "set up" type. He was the editor of a weekly paper before he became a prelate, and his compositors went out on strike. In this emergency he took to the case himself, and industriously acquired the art of typesetting. He afterwards called the strike a blessing in disguise, as it saved him the trouble of writing any more leading articles. Thenceforward he put them in type straight from his head.

Cardinal Gibbons is a fervent advocate of pedestrianism as a means of