

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, B.A., Thomas Coffey, L.L.D., Associate Editor—R. F. Mackintosh, Manager—Robert M. Burns. Address business letters to the Manager, Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted, etc., 50 cents each insertion. Remittance must accompany the order. Where Catholic Record Box address is required send 10 cents to prepay expense of postage upon replies. Ordinary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 50 cents. The Catholic Record has been approved and recommended by Archbishops Falconio and Shevart, late Apostolic Delegate to Canada, the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Halifax, Peterborough and Oshesburg, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion. In St. John, N. B., single copies may be purchased from Mrs. M. A. McGuire, 240 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. Milroy, 241 St. Catherine St. West. In Ottawa, Ont., single copies may be purchased from J. W. Aldrin, 141 Neil St. The following agents are authorized to receive subscriptions and canvass for The Catholic Record: General Agents—M. J. Hagarty, Stephen V. James, George J. Quigley, Resident Agents—Miss Briele Saunders, Sydney; E. R. Costello, 141 10th Ave. West, Vancouver, B. C.; Silas Johnson, 210 Rochester St., Montreal; Mrs. E. Smith, 2255 Manoe St., Montreal; Mrs. Edward McPike, 224 Martin Ave., Elmwood, Winnipeg, Man.

LONDON, SATURDAY, DEC. 10, 1921

"CONNECTION WITH THE CIVIC SCHOOL SYSTEM"

"Dr. Claude Brown, Separate school member of the London Board of Education, has forwarded his resignation to that body, which will probably be considered at the next board meeting. "Both Separate school trustees have now resigned—Dr. W. J. Tillmann resigned last summer—and it is believed that the Separate School Board has thus severed all connection with the civic school system.

"The Board of Education asked the Separate School Board to appoint a member in Dr. Tillmann's place, but so far no action has been taken."

The foregoing news item appeared in the London Free Press, Tuesday of last week. No reason whatever is given or suggested for the action of the Separate School Board. Readers are left to infer that these peculiar people, the Catholics, have no reason worth mentioning for "severing all connection with the civic school system."

Yet there is a very good and easily intelligible reason.

The "civic school system"—to retain the reporter's strange phraseology—consists of Public schools, Separate schools and the Collegiate Institute. The Public schools are maintained and administered by those who use them; likewise the Separate schools. There never was any connection between these two Boards in so far as the maintenance and administration of these two distinct sets of schools are concerned. Therefore there has been no severance of this non-existent connection. And Separate schools equally with the Public schools remain part and parcel of the "civic school system." Remains the Collegiate Institute for the building, equipment and maintenance of which Separate school supporters are taxed dollar for dollar with the supporters of the Public schools. But in the expenditure of these taxes, in the policy of the administration, Separate school supporters have no effective voice. In this matter Catholics are denied the full rights of citizenship though they are forced to bear their full share of its burdens.

Since Public and Separate schools are administered by two separate and distinct Boards elected by the Public and Separate school ratepayers respectively, one would naturally expect that in the matter of the Collegiate Institute for which both classes of ratepayers are taxed there would be a Board elected by all the ratepayers. Such is not the case.

The whole elective Public School Board together with two representatives appointed by the Separate School Board constitute the Board of Education which controls and administers Collegiate Institute affairs.

This may appear to many fair-minded Protestants to be an equitable arrangement and doubtless it was so intended to be. But a little consideration will show that it is in reality a flagrant case of taxation without representation; worse, while denied equal status, though equally taxed, we are humbugged with a pretended representation that is worthless, farcical.

A year ago High School affairs here in London showed very clearly that this is no captious complaint, but an intolerable grievance that can neither be borne by self-respecting Catholics, nor endorsed by those of our fellow-citizens who make any profession of justice and square dealing.

Over a year ago, under the heading "Taxation Without Representation," we wrote as follows:

The High School situation in London illustrates very clearly the anomalous position of Catholics with regard to secondary education.

The Collegiate Institute building was burned down some months ago, and the question has arisen whether one central school should be erected to replace the burned building, or whether the city should undertake to erect three separate buildings on different sites each with its own staff and equipment. The present Board favors the three schools scheme.

The local papers inform us in flaring headlines that "Three Collegiate will be the Issue in a Hot Campaign in the Board of Education Election." Opinion is divided. In some quarters opposition to the increased taxation alleged to be involved in the second scheme is very pronounced. There is no doubt that this issue will dominate all others and determine the result of the election. But the six thousand Catholics of London will cast not one single vote for or against the proposal favored by the Board.

Yet every single Catholic will be called upon to pay dollar for dollar with his Protestant fellow-citizens in the taxation required to erect, equip, staff and maintain these schools.

Apart from the question of cost is the question of which plan will best serve the interests of secondary education in London.

In the "hot campaign" over this issue to help decide the question on its merits, not a single Catholic vote will be cast. In passing we may say that personally we favor the three-school plan. Experience has shown conclusively, we believe, that the successful working of High Schools is in inverse ratio to their size. The school with a very great number of pupils suffers both in efficiency and discipline. But that is not the question. The glaring anomaly is this, that in a matter to be decided by the votes of the people not a single Catholic will cast a vote, though every Catholic in London is equally interested in the cost involved and in the merits of the plan that will eventually be adopted.

It will be urged that the Separate School Board appoints two representatives to the Board of Education which controls our common interests in secondary education. That is a sop to Cerberus. It does not effect what we have said in the least. Catholics, like non-Catholics, will differ in their views on the question in issue. Why should they be deprived of equal rights at the polls? Why should not each and every Catholic, like each non-Catholic, have a voice in the decision of this matter?

A High School Board should be elected by all the people, if all the people are to be taxed to maintain High Schools.

Then each individual member of this Board would represent all the people, would be amenable to the general public opinion, Catholic as well as non-Catholic; and accountable to all alike for his stewardship. We might not have a single Catholic on the Board in that case; but we should be adequately represented, and we could exercise a direct influence over the Board as a whole and over each individual member thereof.

As it is, the control of secondary education is practically confined to non-Catholics, yet Catholics are compelled to bear their full share of the burdens of maintenance of secondary schools.

The present London situation should at least serve to bring home to Catholics the fact that in the matter of secondary education they are the victims of a law that imposes on them taxation without adequate or effective representation, a grievance that in more virile times was the occasion of historic protests.—THE CATHOLIC RECORD, November 13th, 1920.

This exemplification of the working out of our present sham representation on Boards of Education having been given to a prominent Protestant lawyer, he exclaimed: "Why that is a rank injustice!"

And we believe that many others, who like this Protestant gentleman have little or no sympathy with Catholic education as such, but who respect the Separate school principle as guaranteed by the

fundamental law of Canada, will on consideration of the facts agree with his verdict.

An awkward complication might have arisen a year ago in the London situation. In the Board of Education partial election the people—that is the Protestants, Catholics having not a single vote—decided at the polls against the three unit proposal, leaving the Board equally divided for and against. If the appointed Separate school representatives had chosen to do so they might have cast their votes in favor of the three unit plan, thus flouting the people's verdict in so far as the partial election could be taken as an expression of their will.

Very wisely the Separate School Board declined to interfere and by resolution, which was published at the time, instructed their appointees accordingly. Their present dignified and self-respecting action in withdrawing their representatives altogether is in logical sequence of this action of a year ago. And both were dictated by the demonstration of the farcical nature of such representation.

Perhaps, some one may object, we could not elect two Catholics if the Collegiate Board were chosen by all the taxpayers. We might not elect even one, but the Board would nevertheless be really representative of Catholics as well as of non-Catholics. Every member of the Board would have to reckon with our votes, would have to secure the approval or run counter to the disapprobation of every Catholic taxpayer when seeking election or reelection. As it is, who cares what Catholics think? They must pay their taxes, but they have no vote! A Catholic veriform appendix to a Protestant-elected Board of Education is a poor substitute for the franchise, and a poor excuse for depriving Catholics of their full rights of citizenship in the matter of secondary education.

HEAR THE OTHER SIDE

The London Board of Education a few weeks ago passed the resolution adopted and sent out by the Toronto Board protesting against any consideration whatever being given to the claims of Separate schools for such legislation as will make effective the rights conferred by the Separate School Act of 1863 and guaranteed, with the unanimous consent of the Fathers of Confederation, by the British North America Act.

The Free Press reports:

"In approving the Toronto resolution the Board 'recorded an emphatic protest against the reopening of the school question by granting to the Roman Catholic bishops any of the concessions demanded, or by passing any regulations that would further extend the sectarian schools in this province at the expense of the public schools that are open to all classes and creeds.'"

This shows the temper and spirit in which the London Board of Education dealt with this important subject. The only extension of "sectarian schools"—by which term is meant our Separate schools—that is asked for is the right conferred by the Act of '63 and guaranteed by the Act which constituted Canada of providing where practicable our own secondary education in our own schools as we did from 1863 to 1871.

That we should ask for the restoration of this right may seem strange to the broadminded members of the London Board of Education who take our High school taxes, but who have to render no account of their stewardship to Catholic taxpayers. That is an unlovely and indefensible feature of "our splendid public and non-sectarian school system of Ontario."

The Free Press report continues: "It was further declared in the resolution that the division of taxes thus would not be in proportion to the taxable property, but in proportion to the population, and similar demands were denounced by Dr. Ryerson and were rejected by the Canadian Parliament in 1855, 1858, 1861 and 1862. To grant the request of the bishops would be a violation of the Act of 1863, and it would also define all Roman Catholics as separate school supporters, and result in crippling of the splendid public and non-sectarian school system of Ontario."

The Archbishop of Toronto in a letter to the press in answer to the allegations of the Toronto Board of Education made this clear and unequivocal declaration:

"The first paragraph attributes to us the advocacy of a basis of division which we have not advocated. We have not proposed any

basis of division. We have simply stated the facts which make it clear that the exemption clause of the Act of 1863 is not now made effective by the Assessment Act, and that it is the duty of the Legislature to make that exemption clause once more effective."

And yet here we have the members of the London Board of Education more than a month later repeating the false charge so explicitly and promptly denied by His Grace.

And so with other false imputations of the Toronto resolution. Now if the Board of Education, which is the irresponsible steward of all the Catholic Collegiate Institute taxes of London, were a little less violently "non-sectarian," and manifested a willingness to hear both sides of the question before taking action, no fault could be found. Indeed we think it would be quite within the province of the Board to discuss the question on its merits—hearing of course the side of its disfranchised constituents—and then make such representations to the Government as reason, not prejudice, might dictate. But that was not the way of the broadminded and non-sectarian Board of Education of London.

It is a pleasure to record that the Chairman, though he too knew that no Catholic might vote for or against him, had the moral courage and sense of decency to protest against the ill-considered, and ill-natured action of the misinformed Board.

"Chairman Coleridge objected that the Board had no right to take any action. He could not see why the Roman Catholics should not have their rights, if they are not now receiving them, and he could not believe that the Legislature is not capable of dealing with the question if the need arises. The trustees should not presume that the legislators would take any action that was prejudicial to the general interests of the province," he thought.

One of the trustees referring to petitions circulated amongst Catholics urged this as a reason for protesting.

"Every denomination has the right to petition the Government for changes in the laws if the members of such denomination believe their rights are being violated," suggested the chairman.

But the resolution passed, the vote standing ten for the resolution with one not voting.

Irresponsible power is bad even for the sectarian-elected members of a non-sectarian Board of Education. It would be far better for them and for us if they were responsible to all the people whose taxes they impose and expend.

We believe, however, that Chairman Coleridge expresses intelligent Protestant opinion much more accurately than do the members of the Board of Education who decided an educational question in a partisan and sectarian spirit without hearing the other side about which they evidently know less than nothing.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

It was in keeping with the antecedents of the Toronto Mail and Empire that in reviewing the career of Rabelais, the great French satirist of the sixteenth century, it should have made the most of the fact that he was once a monk, and his abandonment of the cloistral life the occasion for sundry ignorant and ill-natured slurs upon monks in general. Rabelais, of course, is one of the great figures in the world's literature, but he is all the more so, in the Mail's judgment, because his life as a monk was not all it should have been, and that his withdrawal was brought about by his free and easy attitude towards revealed religion, and the coarseness of his references to sacred persons and things. The Mail is constrained to admit that Rabelais' humor was a "trifle coarse," and his "exaggerations so gross as to take leave of reality," but nevertheless he would have been a "delightful companion in most companies," whereas the monks, who refused to smile upon his coarse sallies or to condone his religious vagaries were "bigoted and ignorant." It is, apparently, part and parcel of the Mail's creed to lose no opportunity of belittling or caricaturing anything Catholic.

As for the monks of the Middle Ages, they need no defence against the Mail's slanders. Time was when the almost universal tradition among dupes of the so-called Reformation was in line with the Mail's benighted ideas. The sixteenth

century champions of the new order had taken too good care to poison the wells of history and of literature against the Church and all her works to leave to those of ordinary opportunities of information any chance of breaking from its meshes. Hence English literature, especially what De Maistre termed "one long conspiracy against the truth," and it is only within the last fifty years or so that that cloud has been lifted and the much-slandered monks been revealed as they really were. So effectively has this been done, however, that no person who values a reputation for learning will now hazard it by repeating the foolish tales that so long did duty for history. The Mail writer is evidently not in that category, but is content to wallow in the slime of exploded tradition rather than bask in the sunlight of truth.

AND AS TO Rabelais, no one, far less a Catholic, is concerned to qualify his title to the possession of genius. His high place in the world's literature is now universally recognized, notwithstanding the coarseness and grossness which the Mail considers should have made him a "delightful companion" in any environment. The truth is that he was one of those individuals not peculiar to any age or country, who was like a fish out of water in any refined society, whether monastic or domestic. He certainly was entirely out of place in a monastery, as his brethren in religion soon found, and it was therefore a foregone conclusion that his wearing of the cowl could not continue indefinitely. And if the monks are to be blamed for looking with anxious eyes upon his fast and loose treatment of the dogmas of the Faith, why should not like blame attach to champions of Divine revelation in any age? It has ever been the way with the world to hurl the opprobrious term "bigot" against those who are steadfast and unyielding in their adherence to revealed truth, and even in our age the spectacle is not uncommon of fanatical individuals siding even with disreputable offcasts from the old Church under the mendacious plea of free thought. But whatever the vagaries of Rabelais, or the limitations of his genius, there is nothing in his life to warrant the presumption that he would have joined in a hue and cry of that kind. Indeed, we are convinced that he never intended his life as a warfare on religion, but was rather the creature of his own eccentricities, and passions, and like the mere man that he was, apt to meet correction with satire, and discipline with abuse.

ONE OF THE most noteworthy incidents of the recent Dante commemorations was the renewal of interest in William Blake's illustrations of the poet's great work. In spite of the fact that Blake regarded Dante as an atheist (a monstrous perversion if ever there was one) and "a mere politician busy about this world," he had the highest admiration for his genius, and when in 1824, he was commissioned to make a series of colored drawings from the "Divine Comedy," to be afterwards engraved, set about the task with enthusiasm. To do this he set to work to learn Italian so as to read the poem in the original, and draw his inspiration therefrom. As a result he produced 68 colored drawings from the "Inferno," 20 from the "Purgatorio," and 10 from the "Paradiso," some of them being done on his sick bed propped up with his portfolio before them. Of these drawings many remained unfinished; seven only were engraved and published during his lifetime. It is said of all of them that Blake's wonderful imaginings, with all their extravagance and eccentricities, come nearer to realizing the creations of Dante than any other drawings extant. Their republication would be a matter of widespread interest.

THE BLESSED MOTHER

We cannot honor the Mother of God too much, nor can we too fully confide in her. We cannot honor her too much, because we know that every offering we make to Mary finds its resting place in the Sacred Heart of her Divine Son. We cannot too fully confide in her. She has held Omnipotence itself in her arms, and He communicated this attribute to her. She is the dispenser of the infinite blessings of Redemption.—Canon Sheehan.

BOY LIFE

WHY IS A BOY BAD?
Adapted from Dr. G. A. Dickinson's "Your Boy."

A boy is not a man—he is not like him either mentally, morally, socially, or physically. If we remember the differences already enumerated and consider what are the sources of conduct, we can easily understand why boys are said to be bad.

A normal boy only gains full control of his activities and emotions when his moral nature and intellect are developed in adolescence. In the progress of mankind a great development of man's higher nature has taken place, so that forethought and virtue are to some extent present in every child, and often their behaviour is better than could be expected. Nevertheless, the boyish traits are uppermost; the baby in the cradle when cramped kicks and cries for freedom, it struggles for liberty and action and often screams and kicks with temper. Older boys show their undisciplined activities and their uncontrolled natures—their outbursts of temper on little provocation, obscenity, passion—often the actions of a class of school-boys during play hours, yelling, running, and quarrelling, would lead an adult, if he had never been a boy, to call them savages.

Boys lack adult understanding in hoarding up that which is useless; they show a want of moral sense in taking that which does not belong to them, in thoughtlessly indulging their appetites, in not having due respect for age and authority, in want of reverence and devotion, and in their determined, destructive ways.

Youth is full of energy and power; these powers the boy must possess before he really knows how to check or to use them, so it is that the conduct during late boyhood and early adolescence, from twelve to sixteen, is two or three times as bad as at any other age. At this age the boy lacks the good sense and moral poise that develops very rapidly at seventeen or eighteen.

So we say a boy is "bad" simply because he lacks understanding and moral sense. Should we call him bad for this reason?

In the same class with the so-called "bad" boy can be placed the fool, the criminal, the insane, the rogue, the savage and the drunkard; their inactive, diseased, or undeveloped higher nature is seen—their conduct is not guided by kindness or consideration, and in each case they suffer accordingly.

As every normal human being is created with the same instincts and faculties, there should not be a very great difference between them, if reared under proper conditions.

Many of the human instincts are the same as those possessed by the higher animals, and when these energies are not under the guidance of man's higher self, conduct is then similar to the animal. It is not a question whether man should or should not possess faculties the same as an animal, neither is it a question of their suppression; in various stages of development and activity they are present in every healthy lad, and they are his by right, and the boy in whom they are strong, provided that in manhood they are blended with moral and mental virtue, will make the highest type of man.

Few will agree that the pranks which most boys play are his by right, but if we understand boy nature nothing will be gained by arguing this point. Boys always did and always will do hasty and what appears to adults unreasonable things, and in doing these things they gain experience that should be of great value in after life. In their pranks they show their boyish ways. They certainly have a right to self-expression and to play, but they need not be allowed to spend a great part of their time in pranks and sport, nor should they always be hampered by fine clothes and velvet carpets of cushioned seats. "A seat fastened to the floor is ill-suited to a boy's nature and needs. When he is kept in it a large part of his time his mind grows but slowly and imperfectly, and he suffers injury to his whole nature."

Allow a boy considerable freedom, shoulder him with some responsibility, provide him with material to use his activities, and keep him under proper control till he becomes responsible.

It is not natural for a boy at fifteen or sixteen to be a man—he has

a sense of right and wrong in process of development, and in time he will be a man.

If we could only know the meaning that a boy in the early teens takes out of certain acts—if we could see, think and feel as a child does, how innocent would not many of a boy's pranks appear! Who can say that a boy in late childhood or early adolescence understands the moral nature of a lie? Is this not one of the things he has to learn?

Boys do many things that are said to be cruel, but who would be so bold as to say that they fully realize what cruelty means, or that they understand what they do?

They must learn, they crave for experience, and if they do not cause suffering in another, and if they do not suffer themselves, how can they fully understand? To bring trouble on himself is to gain experience, is to fully grasp the consequence of his act; the boy is thus led to abstain from such acts in the future. Hence anger, passion, envy, and many other actions in the child are self-correcting, self-arresting.

If a boy were reared under such conditions that he never saw a fight, never was in one, and he never suffered from his own foolishness what sort of a man would he make? The very best way to sharpen a boy's wits and to cure him from wanting to ride every fractious horse that his father owns is to let him ride. Life is in living, it is an indefinite struggle and fight, and the boy who never did a foolish thing never did a wise one.

What would be called bad in an adult man can not always be considered such in a child. The child is a being in process of development, and can hardly be said to be either good or bad; though it is true, he will become one or the other.

If we change a boy's activities the habits will change. The bad will waste and die from disuse and the good will take its place.

BIRTH CONTROL REPUDIATED

ARCHBISHOP HAYES DID NOT STOP MEETING

(By N. C. W. C. News Service)

New York, Nov. 25.—Officers and members of the executive committee of the New York Academy of Medicine refuse to have that institution included among the corporate advocates of birth control, in which category Mrs. Juliet Barrett Rublee of New York attempted to place it by declaring that the Academy had sanctioned certain practices which the Birth Control League encourages. Far from favoring birth control, officers of the Academy say, they repudiate the whole propaganda.

The formal statement issued by the Academy through Dr. Charles L. Dana, chairman, and Dr. E. H. Lewinski-Gorwin, executive secretary, is as follows:

"The Committee is emphatically opposed to the methods, principles and program of the Birth Control League. The committee endorsed a bill which simply confirmed by legislative action the decision of Justice Kelly of the New York Supreme Court interpreting the law as allowing physicians to furnish information to their patients when such information was essential for the preservation of their health."

CLEARS ARCHBISHOP

Statements made by Harold Cox, editor of the Edinburgh Review, Mrs. Sanger and other propagandists for birth control that Archbishop Hayes had prompted the police of New York to prevent a meeting in the Town Hall ten days ago, are refuted by members of the firm of Winthrop Smith & Company by whom full responsibility is assumed for complaining against the public discussion and advocacy of contraception.

In a letter to the New York World signed with the firm's name, the writer explains why the members of the company complained of the meeting, and compliments the Catholic Church on its vigilance in the interest of religion and health.

The letter is as follows: "On page 8 of this morning's World we observe that the so-called 'Birth-Control Committee,' whose meeting was stopped by the police last Sunday at the Town Hall accused the Catholic Church as behind the movement to stop the meeting."

"We should like to dispute this, because none of us here were influenced in any way by the Catholic Church, and there is only one Catholic in this firm. We were one of the complainants against the meeting, influenced to do so by Dr. Leonard K. Hirschberg of Johns Hopkins University, whose articles in the Washington Post and other papers said that attempts at 'birth-control' in the manner proposed by those concerned with this so-called 'Birth-Control Committee' are unphysiological, lead to sterility