

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.
United States and Europe—\$2.00.
Publisher & Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.
Editor, Rev. James T. Foley, R. A.
Associate Editor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.
Manager, Robert M. Burns.

LONDON, SATURDAY, MARCH 4, 1922

LENTEN REGULATIONS FOR 1922

FOLLOWING ARE THE LENTEN REGULATIONS FOR DIOCESE OF LONDON

All days in Lent, Sundays excepted, are fast days. The law of fasting ordains that only one full meal a day be taken, but does not forbid a small amount of food in the morning and in the evening, according to the approved custom of one's locality. The full meal may be taken in the evening and the collation at noon.

Flesh meat is allowed on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays, except the Saturday of Ember Week and the forenoon of Holy Saturday. For those who are obliged to fast, it is allowed only at the principal meal on these days. Those, however, who are not bound to fast may use meat at all meals when its use is allowed to the others at the principal meal. The law of abstinence forbids the eating of flesh meat and of broth made of meat, but does not exclude the use of eggs, milk and products of milk, and any seasonings of food, even drippings and lard.

The prohibition to use fish and flesh at the same meal during Lent has been abolished.

The Lenten fast and abstinence cease at twelve o'clock noon on Holy Saturday.

Persons who have not completed their twenty-first year and those who have begun their sixtieth year are not bound by the law of fasting.

The precept of abstinence obliges all who have completed their seventh year, even those who have passed the age of sixty.

All persons in ill health or engaged in hard labor, or who have any other legitimate reason, may be dispensed from both the law of fast and of abstinence. In order, however, to safeguard conscience, the faithful should have the judgment of their pastor or confessor when they seek a dispensation or feel exempted from the law.

Whatever may be the obligation in the matter of fast or abstinence, Lent is for everybody a season of mortification and of penance.

From this law no one can escape, and in it no one has the right of dispensation.

Pastors are earnestly requested to preach during the holy season of Lent the necessity of penance and the obligation of Christian mortification. They will also provide special means whereby their people may advance in devotion and piety.

As in the past, two appropriate week day services will be held in each Church, and the necessary permission for Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament on these occasions is hereby accorded.

A special effort ought also be made to have the sacred practice of family prayer in common, and especially the recitation of the Rosary, a duty of honor and religion during this penitential time.

MICHAEL FRANCIS FALLON,
Bishop of London.

"JUSTICE FOR ROMAN CATHOLICS"

Under this heading the Christian Guardian, the Methodist Church paper, has an editorial article with this opening paragraph:

"Bishop Fallon rings the changes on his plea for justice for the Roman Catholics in regard to Separate schools, and he intimates very clearly that if the Protestants of Ontario do not grant his demands they will be guilty of serious injustice. What is there in the plea?"

We read thus far with a good deal of satisfaction. Here was a plain indication that an opponent was about to discuss in an honest and straightforward way the grounds on which Bishop Fallon based his plea. We read on with a growing sense of disappointment. There was no such discussion.

The next paragraph tells us what the writer "thinks," and what he "believes," but not a word of discussion of the bishop's plainly stated arguments, that we are asking only for what any fair interpretation of the Separate Schools Act of 1869 concedes. All claims for fair and just interpretation and administration of the Separate Schools Act the Christian Guardian dismisses thus:

"If he is willing to abide by the Act, then let him submit his claims to the proper court and let the court decide."

On another famous occasion the Guardian's not entirely Christian spirit was exemplified by the question:

"Is it so nominated in the bond?"

Believing that their representatives in the Ontario Legislature

were animated by no such spirit Catholic citizens and tax-payers respectfully requested them to look into their school claims and to "enact such legal measures as will put the Roman Catholic minority of this province in the full enjoyment of its educational rights under the Constitution." The members of the Legislature by virtue of their office are responsible for the administration of the school laws of Ontario including the Separate Schools Act; they are likewise responsible for such amending legislation as from time to time may be necessary or desirable, including that which may be necessary or desirable to carry out the intent and purpose of the Separate Schools Act of 1869.

Why should not Catholic constituents petition their own representatives in the Legislature to look into and to remedy their school grievances? Any one else might do it, any other class might petition for any conceivable thing and no one would question their right to do so. This elementary right exercised by Catholics calls forth this from the Christian Guardian:

"And so he chooses to appeal to the Legislature rather than to the courts, and back his appeal by a petition signed, we suppose, by most of the Separate school supporters and back of this appeal and this petition is the palpable threat that every man who dares to vote against the plea of the bishop and his co-religionists must expect to find the Roman Catholic vote lined up against him solidly at the next election. This may look to the bishop like political wisdom, but to us it seems certain to arouse the most regrettable religious controversies and to deepen religious prejudices, which are already too strong."

Now, Bishop Fallon has written a great deal on this subject and published much. He spoke at great length a short time ago in Massey Hall and the newspapers gave lengthy summaries of his address, the Telegram published it in full.

If it can find in Bishop Fallon's printed or spoken word justification for its alleged "palpable threat" the Christian Guardian would be a good deal less open to the charge of attempting "to arouse the most regrettable religious controversies and to deepen religious prejudice" at a time when fair discussion—no matter how strenuously opposed to our claims—would be a public service and a welcome example of Christian and civic virtue.

Then the Guardian talks of France and Italy which is about as pertinent to the question as if it proved that the man in the moon is a Methodist.

Attributing to Bishop Fallon a dictatorial attitude and tone, which it does not because it cannot attempt to justify by specific quotations, the Guardian says:

"The truth is that what the bishop is demanding is not an act of justice in any shape or form, but simply an extension of a privilege such as is permitted to no other Church in this province. Better call things by their right names!"

Then why call a Right that is embodied in the fundamental law of Canada, an undeniable Constitutional Right, a Privilege? And if Catholics have an undeniable right to Separate schools, how is that right affected by the fact that the members of other Churches having what they want in the matter of schools do not ask for and would not have Separate schools?

Call our Constitutional right to Catholic Separate schools by its right name.

The Guardian may as well recognize once for all that we have Separate schools and we have them by a solemnly guaranteed treaty right. Then it would not be continually playing about the fringes of the question and would give its readers the starting point of intelligent discussion. Calling things by their right names would be a good beginning.

The next paragraph must be given in full for here the Guardian actually touches some of the concrete points of the question:

"In his Open Letter Bishop Fallon claims that the school taxes levied upon publicly-owned utilities, such as railways and the hydro electric, and the taxes levied on banks, and apparently all corporations, shall be divided between the Separate and Public schools, presumably in proportion to the school attendance. But already all the banks and corporations have the right to divert their taxes, in whole or in part, to the Separate schools and the Home Bank and other corporations do so, and if the bishop is expecting that Ontario will compel all corporations to pay a proportion of their taxes to help teach the Roman Catholic catechism,

he is surely strangely ignorant of the spirit of democracy." (The italics are the Guardian's own.)

"In his Open Letter"—the Guardian's readers may now expect to get just what Bishop Fallon is asking for and the grounds on which he bases his plea—but they will be disappointed.

They get an unfair and misleading summary of what Bishop Fallon says calculated to justify the indignant conclusion of a discussion that deliberately evades the questions in issue.

Here is what the bishop did say as the Christian Guardian is fully aware unless it has been discussing the Open Letter without having read it:

"(a) There are certain properties owned by the Dominion of Canada, or by the Province of Ontario and its municipalities. Such are the National Railways, the Hydro Electric System, Radial Railroads and similar concerns. The credit of these systems is carried by Separate School supporters equally with all other citizens; their ownership is vested as much in the Catholics of this Province as it is in non-Catholics. When Catholics demand their proportionate share of the school taxes accruing from these public properties, they are seeking no favor but are insisting upon the recognition of a fundamental right."

What does the Christian Guardian say to this?

Nothing.

Not a single word.

Why? Because it is an indisputable fact that Separate school supporters own their proportionate share of publicly owned properties. It follows inexorably that they have a right to their proportionate share of the school tax paid on such properties. According to the present law Separate schools have a right to about forty per cent. of such taxes, for Catholics are forty per cent. of the population. But the law is unworkable. Is that a reason why an undeniable right should be withheld and any workable provision for a reasonable apportionment of these taxes be refused?

Catholics ask that they be no longer deprived of their share of school taxes on publicly owned properties.

The Christian Guardian evades this point altogether. It obscures it, then dishonestly sums up by its italicized insinuation.

The bishop then speaks of another class of properties:

"(b) Banks, Street Railways, and other such corporations receive their franchises or charters from the people at large; they enjoy privileges, in many cases monopolies, which are given them by the representatives of all the people. Unless Catholics are to be excluded from the enjoyment of their civic rights, they may not be justly denied a fair share of the school taxes of these Public Service Corporations."

There is no question at all that Catholics have an equity in all Public Service Corporations.

That our Protestant friends recognize this fact, and assert it vigorously on occasion, is shown conclusively in the matter of the Toronto Street Railway. The stock in this company was held largely by a Catholic now deceased. In 1891 it was found that it would be of very decided advantage to the company and to the city alike to amend the charter so as to allow the substitution of electricity for horses.

Under the provision of the law that the Christian Guardian and Mr. Hocken now insistently extol as a fair and adequate provision for the apportionment of school taxes, the bulk of the street railway taxes would go to the Separate schools.

Did the Toronto city council in 1891 act on this assumption? Oh, no. The council held up the charter unless and until it was agreed to insert a clause whereby all the school taxes should go to the Public schools!

If instead of hogging all the taxes after the manner that has earned for Toronto an unenviable sobriquet in many parts of Ontario the council had claimed a share of the railway taxes proportionate to the school attendance it would have aided in establishing a fair and equitable principle in regard to Public Service Corporation taxes. As it is it has established beyond cavil that the ownership of stock in Public Service Corporations is not a fair basis for the distribution of the taxes. All citizens, whether Public or Separate school supporters, have unquestionably the same equity in such corporations. Catholics are part of the public; they are not pariahs.

The Guardian does not deny this. It carefully evades the question.

But it lumps these with publicly owned properties and other corporations, and indignantly asks if Bishop Fallon wants to compel all corporations to pay for the teaching of the Roman Catholic catechism!

A precious example of fair and straightforward discussion of a question of public interest!

What has the Catechism to do with the case?

Now let us skip to the last paragraph, where The Guardian says: "He instances the case of a family where the father is a non-Catholic and the mother a Roman Catholic and the children go to a Separate school, while the father's taxes go to the Public school."

Note "the case of a family."

Note what Bishop Fallon says:

"(d) The Separate Schools of Ontario are educating thousands of Catholic children whose parents are not allowed to pay their taxes to the schools in which their children are educated, the reason being that such children are the offspring of marriages where the fathers are non-Catholics. Catholics ask the recognition of the principle that the school which educates the children should benefit by the taxes of the parents. This is a matter of obvious equity, with which every honorable man should be glad to make the letter of the law harmonize."

We try hard to believe the Christian Guardian is honest. But note the difference between what the Bishop says and what the Guardian says that he says:

"The bishop thinks," continues the Guardian, "that we should compel that non-Catholic father to pay his taxes to the Separate school. Why not insist that the children should be sent to the Public school? That is certainly open to the Separate school at all times. But to compel any man to pay his taxes to the Separate schools against his will does not strike us as a very just or wise thing." Italics ours.

The Bishop thinks nothing of the kind. The bishop said nothing of the kind. The bishop asks that such non-Catholic father should be allowed to pay his taxes to the school that educates his children.

That is too reasonable; so The Guardian distorts it, but, as usual, makes no attempt whatever to substantiate its queer and unwarranted interpretation of Bishop Fallon's contentions by direct quotations.

Now we come to corporations in general. In the Open Letter the bishop wrote:

"(c) There are, besides, many other corporations in which Catholics are shareholders. The present provisions of the Assessment Act in regard of the allotment of the school taxes of these corporations are inoperative or ineffective, except in the case of small or local corporations. Catholics ask for such amendments to the Assessment Act as will remedy this defective legislation." Italics ours.

Now this refers only to those corporations that are not corporations operating publicly owned properties, and that are not in the second class of public service corporations, and then only in the case when the religion of the stockholders cannot be determined. We have already given the case of the Loew Theatre in London. Take such corporations as the C. P. R. Of what use is the present law? It is impossible to determine what proportion of the shareholders are Catholics. The bishop asked that some provision be made for such cases where the present law is inoperative or ineffective.

These are the facts; let any honest man decide whether or not they justify the Guardian's presentation of them.

The Christian Guardian has a horror of compelling people in this matter of school taxes. Yet the Spanish River Pulp and Paper Company was compelled to pay all its school taxes to Public schools when it believed it "manifestly unfair" to do so; desiring to do "scent justice" to the Separate school it was compelled to do what was condemned by its judgment and conscience.

Non-Catholic fathers who desire their children educated in the Separate schools are compelled to pay to the schools that give him no return. In this age of woman's emancipation has the mother no parental rights at all? Let us have less compulsion and more reasonable permission for the taxpayer, whether personal or corporate.

It is somewhat discouraging to see a Church paper like the Christian Guardian in discussing a question of public interest mislead its readers and refuse even to state fairly the proposals to which it objects. The consolation is that such a course is, in the long run, bound to defeat its own object.

HEAR THE OTHER SIDE

Although, as probably every reader of the CATHOLIC RECORD is aware, individual Protestants are not only willing to hear our side of the school case but are keenly desirous of the opportunity of fully informing themselves on the matter, yet too many public or quasi-public bodies have shown the zeal that is not according to discretion and with indecent haste have condemned what they evidently do not understand or want to understand.

In pandering to prejudice ministers of religion may secure a temporary and cheap triumph, and enjoy the applause of those whose religion is little more than party spirit; but in the long run we fear they will have forfeited much and gained nothing worth while.

It is refreshing to come across once in a while the evidence of a more Christian spirit in Christian ministers, an exhibition of fair play and square dealing on the part of fellow-citizens.

Amongst the members of the Ministerial Alliance of this City of London there are of course some of the former class; but that there are others who are moved by higher motives is evident from the following account of their meeting last week taken from the Mail and Empire of Feb. 21st:

Rev. W. R. McIntosh, of King Street Presbyterian Church, stated that he did not share the "extreme view" of his Anglican colleagues, as he felt it is better to have Separate schools with the Bible than Public schools without it. He was convinced from his reading of history that Protestant educational institutions have been better than the Roman Catholic institutions, but he held that before formulating a policy the alliance should hear both sides of the issue. "It is not our intention," he stated, "to fight Roman Catholics, but to fight materialism. Money is needed for purposes of education, and credit is due any organization, Protestant or Catholic, which can get money out of soulless corporations. At any rate, we must make a fair study of the matter, and it would be well for us, not only to hear Dr. Edwards, but also to hear the view which Bishop Fallon takes on the matter. If any of this Godless money can be got for purposes of education, and without detriment to Protestant organizations, so much the better."

Again at a meeting of the London Presbytery the matter came up and was thus dealt with according to the Free Press of Feb. 22nd:

Although it was generally believed that the presbytery would take action on the matter of the demands of the Roman Catholics for Separate High schools supported out of the public tax rate and the revenue derived from corporations, the issue was shelved till next meeting. It was introduced through a communication from the Board of Education, Toronto, which asked that the ministers rally to the defense of the Public schools, which were likely to be adversely affected by the satisfaction of the appeal for competitive continuation schools.

One of the ministerial delegates took the ground that the presbytery should move against any departure from the present educational system, which, he declared, had been built upon genius and experience. Rev. D. C. MacGregor, moderator of the presbytery, pointed to the seriousness of the question and stated that if the members were not in accord with the proposals of the Roman Catholics that they should support those associations which were opposing them.

Dr. McDonald pointed to the lack of data available on the whole question. His motion that it may be laid over till next month and that a committee secure information in the meanwhile on the subject was agreed to. Members of the committee are Dr. McDonald, Inspector Thompson, D. Ross, Dr. McNair and Mr. Galbraith.

Dr. McDonald and the London Presbytery are to be congratulated; for it is quite evident from the above account of the proceedings that the Presbytery is not only lacking in reliable information on the subject, but laboring under positive misinformation.

It is at any rate a hopeful sign of a more wholesome spirit when a Presbytery decides to hear the other side before reaching a decision.

ONE TRAIL, BUT MANY RED HERRINGS

BY THE OBSERVER

No one can understand the press despatches concerning recent events in Ireland, who is not acquainted with the traditional method of anti-Irish discussion of Irish questions.

That method has one fixed principle, and from the days of Queen Anne to the days of Sir James Craig, that principle has always been acted upon. One may fairly regard it as a principle in some sort instinctive; for it does not seem

likely that the Craigs and that ilk in our day, are acquainted with the writings of the hiring writers who were paid by Queen Anne's ministers to write the Irish race into the contempt and hatred of mankind.

This principle is a simple one; it is, to begin and maintain the discussion of all questions touching Ireland, by concealing and ignoring the fact or facts on which the Irish have based their actions. In the most recent case, the fighting and raiding on the borders of what is called "Ulster," the two essential facts which explained the action of the Sinn Feiner's were, first the prospective execution of certain prisoners in Derry jail; and, second, the imprisonment of a football team in "Ulster," who had come from the south, on the pretext that some of them were carrying revolvers.

From those two facts the whole of the recent trouble started. The prisoners in Derry jail were men who were arrested because of their participation in disorders which were caused by Orange raids on the Catholic minority in "Ulster;" and the proposal to execute them was considered to be entirely contrary to the spirit of the understanding recently arrived at, at London; and so it was.

The arrest of the football team was an outrage. There may be a law that no one shall carry arms; but that law has been continually broken for years past by the very members of the "Ulster Parliament" and at their direct instigation. The street fighting in Belfast has been, in the main, a series of pogroms directed against the Catholic workmen of that city; thousands of whom were chased out of the Belfast Shipyards in July 1920, and have never been allowed to go back. If under those circumstances, some of the football players, when they started for Derry, put revolvers in their pockets, they acted quite reasonably.

Now, observe the course of the most recent news conspiracy against the Catholic part of Ireland and against the Irish Free State. Note in recent despatches, the following general marks:

(1) Suppression of the two facts stated, or casual mention, without stating their connection with the raids and kidnappings.

(2) The representation of Craig and his little two-by-four parliament as standing for peace, order, and good government; omitting all mention of the part Belfast Orangemen played in the pogroms of the past few months.

(3) The picturing of the English Government as detached, helpless, aloof, benevolently interested, but quite powerless; though no legislation has yet been passed to enable the Free State even to appoint one policeman or hold even one magistrate's court.

England has always taken everything in Ireland except responsibility; it is the traditional policy of English statesmen to refuse to take the responsibility, and to throw it on the Irish people themselves. They have always been willing that the people of Ireland should have the responsibility, provided England and England's Orange garrison, had the power and the profit.

Now they are gradually abandoning their Orange garrison; but their most recent act is to give that garrison a new disguise to wear; the disguise of a so-called parliament. It is the old garrison under a new disguise; and having power, still with no very clear idea of what they are to do with that power, now that garrisoning is to be their job no longer, they are using it in sniping at the Catholics of Belfast, putting a harmless football team in jail, and in being as nasty and troublesome as their history and traditions impel them to be.

Note.—Whatever may be true of the past we are quite convinced that the British Government is now, at the express request of the Provisional Government, lending every possible assistance by refraining from interference.—E. C. R.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

APART ALTOGETHER from the merits or demerits of Prohibition, those who seem disposed to consider it the one and only solvent of crime will not have derived much consolation from a speech delivered in Congress by Representative Tinkham of New York.

In a careful analysis of crime increase in Washington a under

prohibition, he finds there is a much greater number of murders there than in London, while Scotland with a population ten times as great as that of Washington and, incidentally, one of the "wettest" countries in the world, has from 100 to 300 per cent. fewer murders than the National Capital.

"One of the causes for this phenomenon," said Mr. Tinkham, "is undoubtedly the character of legislation passed during the last eight or nine years by the Congress of the United States, the methods employed for its enactment, and a consequent loss of respect by the people for these laws and for all law, and the holding of Congress in contempt rather than in esteem or reverence."

"During these years," he continued, "the people have seen Congress pass laws of profound importance dictated to it by liberal minorities outside of Congress, sometimes for purely personal economic ends of the minorities, sometimes sumptuary laws from sectarian sources, sometimes laws directed by 'blobs' or minorities within Congress itself for purely selfish class purposes, or purposes purely of reprisal."

THE EFFECT of all these regulatory laws according to Mr. Tinkham, is "the destruction and elimination of the American home, where no longer does the child know to whom to turn for authority and direction, and from which modern industrialism has subtracted parental care, and State supervision and intrusion weakened parental obligations."

WHETHER ONE endorses in all respects this telling arraignment or not, the facts cited certainly should give pause to those misguided if well-meaning individuals who just in proportion as they relax their hold upon religious dogma, go to further and further extremes in substituting man-made regulations which tend to circumscribe the inherent rights of the individual, and make the irresponsible human intellect the last court of appeal in matters of belief and conduct.

ANOTHER RECENT utterance along this line was that of Senator Stanley. He declared that the tendency toward centralization of government and the enactment of prohibitory legislation is threatening the abolition of the autonomy of the State, and points straight to the destruction of the liberty of the citizen, and can end only in extinction of the Republic. "Put in force this Act (referring to a bill then before the House) and then endeavor to convince a civilized world that this is the land of the free and the home of the brave."

At the risk of over extending the quotation we feel that we cannot substitute for the Senator's own words any comment that would be so effective. "More than 15,000 bills have been introduced in the present Congress," he went on, "Bills by the bale, passed and pending, and a blind and intolerant propaganda still grinding at the over-worked legislative mill. Bills to inspect, operate or regulate 'the butcher, the baker and the candlestick maker.' Bills to fix the price and control the distribution of lumber and coal, to regulate the making or marketing of cloth and grain. To censor, supervise, stop or cure base-ball, horse racing, moving pictures and the social evil. 'Nobody escapes—everything in the moral, industrial and commercial world is to be owned, operated, supervised or censored from the birth of a baby to the burial of a corpse, and the worst is not yet.'

"In the ownership, operation or supervision of the industrial and commercial activities of an empire, from telegraphs and telephones, steamships and railroads to the elimination of the boll weevil and the setting of a hen, Congress has created one hundred different committees and commissions, boards and bureaus, and within ten years has actually expended the appalling sum of \$3,921,360,167.55, according to the official figures of these departments. If, however, the more dependable estimates of that able and accurate statesman, Senator King, of Utah, are accepted, it reaches the incomprehensible aggregate of \$7,500,000,000. The bulk of this money was squandered