

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$1.50 per annum.
United States—\$2.00 per annum.
Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, Ltd. D.
Editors: Rev. James T. Foley, B. A.
Thomas Coffey, Ltd. D.
Associate Editors: Rev. F. J. O'Sullivan,
H. P. MacIntyre.
Manager—Robert M. Burns.

Advertisements for teachers, situations, wanted, etc., 50 cents each insertion. Remittance to accompany the order.
Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 50 cents.

Approved and recommended by Archbishops of Canada, the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough and Oshawa, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

The following agents are authorized to receive subscriptions and canvass for the CATHOLIC RECORD:

General agents: M. J. Hagarty, Vincent R. Cox, and Miss Jessie Doyle; resident agents: Mrs. W. E. Smith, Halifax; Miss Edith Saunders, Sydney; Miss L. Harrington, Winnipeg; E. R. Conville, 225 1/2 Ave. West, Vancouver, B. C.; Miss Rose Johnson, 211 Rochester St., Ottawa; Miss Rose McKenney, 161 D'Avignon St., Quebec; Mrs. Geo. Smith, 203 St. Louis St., Montreal; M. J. Morvin, Montreal; B. F. O'Toole, Lebrun, Sask.; and J. Murphy, Box 125, Saskatoon.
In St. John, N. E., single copies may be purchased from Mrs. M. A. McGuire, 249 Main Street, and John J. Dwyer.
In Sydney, N. S., single copies may be purchased from Mrs. M. A. McGuire, 249 Main Street, and John J. Dwyer.
In Montreal single copies may be purchased from S. Miller, 341 St. Catherine St. West.

LONDON, SATURDAY, MARCH 8, 1919

OFFICIAL

The Archbishop's House,
Quebec, 24th Feb., 1919.

To His Lordship
Mgr. Michael Francis Fallon,
Bishop of London:

My Lord:

His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Quebec desires me to transmit to you the enclosed Rescript which he has just received from His Excellency Monsignor Pietro Di Maria.

I have the honor to be

My Lord

Your Lordship's humble servant
ALFONSE GAGNON, Priest,
Secretary.

The Sacred Congregation of the Council

Most Holy Father:

The Cardinal Archbishop of Quebec and the other Ordinaries of Canada humbly petition Your Holiness for an indulgence in virtue of which the law of abstinence may be transferred from Saturday to Wednesday during Lent, with the exception of Quinquagesima week and Ember week.

In an audience the 14th of January, 1919

Our most Holy Lord BENEDICT XV., P.O.P., having heard the matter proposed for consideration from the undersigned Cardinal Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Council, graciously grants the desired indulgence for two years.

(Sd.) F. CARDINAL CASSETTA, Prefect.
I. MORI, Secretary.

According to Canon Law the days of abstinence during the ordinary weeks of Lent are Friday and Saturday. These two days coming together would cause obvious inconvenience, especially to working men in a vigorous climate like that of Canada; hence the request of the Cardinal and other bishops which the Holy Father has kindly granted.
—E. C. R.

THE LENTEN REGULATIONS FOR 1919

THE FOLLOWING ARE THE LENTEN REGULATIONS FOR THE 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 a collation at noon.

Flesh meat is allowed at the principal meal on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays, except the Saturday of Ember Week and the forenoon of Holy Saturday. The law of abstinence forbids the eating of flesh meat and of broth made of eggs, milk and products of milk (namely—cheese and butter); and any seasonings of food, even those made from the fat of animals.

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

The Lenten fast and abstinence cease at 12 o'clock noon on Holy Saturday.

Persons under twenty years of age or those who have reached their sixtieth year are not bound by the law of fasting, and all persons in ill health or engaged in hard labor or who have any other legitimate excuse, may be dispensed from both the law of fast and of abstinence.

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

Soldiers serving in the Army or Navy are exempt from both fast and abstinence, with the exception of Ash Wednesday, Good Friday, and the forenoon of Holy Saturday, which are to be observed as days of abstinence.

A person dispensed from abstinence is not thereby dispensed from fasting, and vice versa, if he is allowed several meals a day, this does not mean that he need not keep the abstinence. In this, as in other cases, a dispensation obtained under false pretences is invalid.

In order, however, to safeguard conscience, the faithful should have the judgment of their pastor or confessor in all cases where they seek dispensation or feel exempted from the law of fast or abstinence.

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 to 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. No urging should be necessary to unite all Catholics in one universal league of prayer, that with the ending of the War, God may help those in authority to bring about social justice, and make of us a more Christian contented people.

✠ MICHAEL FRANCIS FALLON,
Bishop of London.

THE INSINUATION OF "DISLOYALTY"

Ireland in the recent election having given her mandate to Sinn Fein whose avowed policy is to make Ireland an independent republic, it has become the usual thing on the part of a certain type of Canadians to meet any expression of sympathy with Ireland's struggle for national freedom with the taunt of disloyalty. There was a time when good sense as well as the rules of logic demanded as an essential condition for intelligent discussion the definition of terms. The use of terms in no clearly defined sense is characteristic of an age of half-education, loose-thinking and looser talking. It would puzzle those who cry disloyalty to sympathizers with Ireland to give a definition of the word which would suit their use of it in this and all other cases. To King John no doubt Cardinal Stephen Langton and the English bishops and barons were pestiferous disloyalists. And yet we owe to them the Great Charter which laid broad and deep the foundation of British liberty. Simon de Montfort was not only disloyal but a rebel and the leader of armed rebellion.

Yet in that great century seven hundred years ago, through these disloyalists and rebels "those changes were made," writes the historian Freeman, "which wrought the body politic of England into a shape which has left future ages nothing to do but to improve in detail." And so we might come down through the ages and find that great names which illumine the pages of the history of every country are the names of those who have been at one time branded as disloyal. Disloyal to whom or to what? There is a loyalty, all history proclaims it, greater than loyalty to king or constituted government; there is loyalty to truth, loyalty to justice and loyalty to liberty. And the Irishman who is loyal to truth and justice and liberty, who is loyal to Ireland, will take his place with the patriots of all lands, in the pages of history and in the hearts of his countrymen, though during the struggle which his loyalty imposes on him, he meet with the usual charges of disloyalty from those who have no better argument to sustain an unjust cause.

But we recognize that there are fair-minded and justice-loving fellow-Canadians who are perturbed over the latest phase of the deathless Irish question. They have been in favor of Home Rule but they can not go so far as an independent Irish republic. Neither do we; nor do we believe that there is any considerable republican sentiment in Ireland notwithstanding the fact that Sinn Fein received seventy per cent of Ireland's representation in the recent election. One of the most prominent and enlightened Sinn Fein leaders, Prof. John McNeill, has written in the English Review that "interdependence" is a more appropriate word than "independence."

What then is the meaning and purpose of Sinn Fein? Over and over again we have shown how constitutionalism was killed in Ireland—slain in the house of its friends, who now bewail the fact that other methods have taken its place. Let us try to illustrate what we conceive to be the purpose and meaning of the new method.

Brown and Jones are in partnership and Brown is the "predominant

partner." He has the greater capital invested, he controls the business absolutely to suit himself; he has grown rich, Jones has grown poor. For years Jones, who though the junior partner has his all invested, has sought by every means in his power to secure a square deal from his powerful and domineering partner; at times some minor concessions are ungraciously thrown at him, but he remains unsatisfied, discontented, and finally comes right out with the proposition to dissolve partnership. Brown laughs at him; "That is out of the question; you can't do that." But, insists the junior partner, I have an absolutely legal right to demand a dissolution of partnership. You don't own me body and soul, the days of slavery are past. I insist on my right and hereby serve notice that I wish the partnership dissolved. "But that would ruin my business," the predominant partner replies, as if that were final and conclusive. "Sorry," says Jones, "but since we can't get along together we must sever our business relationship. It is my right if I choose to exercise it, and I am now about to take the necessary legal proceedings to withdraw from the firm and set up in business for myself. No court will refuse my application."

At this stage it might be expected that Brown would endeavor to come to an understanding with his partner if he avers he cannot think of carrying on business without him. This is the stage at which Ireland and England have now arrived. That Ireland, according to the declarations of universal democratic principles made over and over again during the four great years just past, has the right to determine her own national destiny is beyond all manner of doubt or question. It would revolt the conscience of civilization to deny to Ireland what is granted to Poland, to Roumania, to the Czechoslovaks and the Jugo-Slavs.

So we have a right to expect, and so we do expect, that England will now come to an understanding with Ireland and continue the partnership.

Thus at any rate has the Sinn Fein policy put the matter squarely up to the predominant partner.

Only a few weeks ago Lloyd George and Bonar Law in their election manifesto said: "There can be no political peace in the kingdom or the empire while the Irish question remains unsettled."

And if it is not settled, as the great Canadian who just been gathered to his fathers had the courageous loyalty to say, it means the bankruptcy of British statesmanship.

Disloyal! They are disloyal and they dishonor England and the traditions and institutions which are the glory of the British Empire, who prevent or who do not do all in their power to further the solution of the one great question on which the good name, the stability and mayhap the very existence of that Empire depends.

Laurier and the Bilingual Resolution

The interesting fact is now disclosed that the late Liberal chieftain resigned the leadership when he found that his English-speaking followers were strongly opposed to the Lapointe resolution on the bilingual situation in Ontario. The opposition was not confined to the members from Ontario, however; those from the West appear to have had still more strenuous objections to federal interference even to the extent of urging the parties to the dispute to come to agreement in the spirit of conciliation and compromise.

By the British North America Act there is no right or legal standing whatever given to the French language outside of Quebec except in the Federal Parliament and Federal Courts. None was asked. In the pre-Confederation debates the only discussion was on the proposed substitution of "shall" for "may" in respect of the clause relating to the debates in Parliament; the object being to make it compulsory rather than permissive. As a result of this discussion, while the requested amendment was refused, came the provision for printing the proceedings of Parliament and Government Departments in both languages. This Sir George Cartier professed to consider a very considerable concession. But though the French language had no rights under the Constitution in Ontario's schools that when any acquired right or privilege in respect of denominational schools has been withdrawn appeals to the Governor-General in

Council for redress. It was under this provision that the Tupper Government proposed to enact remedial legislation in the case of Manitoba. This was the only Constitutional course open to the bilingualists in the matter of their alleged grievance in Ontario. And this course it was proposed to pursue. Sir Wilfrid, true to the principles which guided his whole public life, had the resolution softened into one of sympathy, requesting a rapprochement in the spirit of conciliation, good will and mutual concession.

The attempt came too late.

Though there is every reason to believe that Sir Wilfrid had made strenuous efforts to restrain his impetuous French compatriots before this, their abuse of privileges conceded, their arrogant demands and insolent flouting of constituted educational authority had created a public sentiment which it was politically impossible for English-speaking Liberals to withstand even to the extent of supporting their Leader's conciliatory resolution. No one knowing Sir Wilfrid Laurier could fail to sympathize with him in the utter failure of his effort at conciliation; nor could any one doubt he was as keenly alive to the blame-worthy course of his French compatriots as he was to the reaction against it on the part of his English followers. Nevertheless his resignation shows how poignantly, for the time at least, he felt the apparent failure of his life-long efforts towards a better mutual understanding and greater good will between the two races.

A fact, which never received the recognition it merited, was that in the speech supporting the resolution Sir Wilfrid emphatically and unequivocally acknowledged Ontario's unquestionable right to enact and enforce Regulation XVII. This statement put squarely across the exorbitant claims asserted by the protagonists of French in Ontario schools and was the best possible guarantee of his good faith, and of the spirit in which he had hoped to come to the better understanding. Though the bilingual resolution exposed him to much honest misunderstanding, much virulent abuse, and much loss of political prestige, there are few who on sober reflection will deny that in this, as in all his deliberate public acts and utterances, Sir Wilfrid was actuated by the highest patriotic motives; nor that, with the characteristic courage and consistency of a strong and honest man, he did with a sinking of the heart what he believed to be a public duty.

The great lesson of his life, the great legacy which he has bequeathed to Canada, can not be fully understood or appreciated if we forget that in early youth, in middle age and in the evening of life, with all the courage and all the loyalty that characterized St. Paul in withstanding Peter to his face, Sir Wilfrid Laurier withstood the unreasonable demands of the people to whom he was allied by blood, by language and by religion as freely and as courageously as he fought the forces of racial and creedal prejudice when directed against them. His dominating thought and purpose at all times being to build up a united Canada. He fought and he conquered. He won by the force of his personality, the honesty of his purpose, the integrity of his life. In defeat he was most emphatically victorious; though dead he speaks and will speak to generations yet to come. His lesson is to no section, class or group of Canadians; but to all without distinction of persons. His legacy is the spirit of peace and good will through mutual forbearance, mutual understanding, fidelity to conviction, courage, honesty, and enlightened public spirit.

NEGLECT OF CIVIC DUTIES

BY THE GLEANER

A careful examination of the question will reveal the fact that much of the social and economic unrest that is so evident at present, and which manifests itself in revolutions, Socialism and labor strikes, may be traced to the neglect of the individual to perform his civic duties. The State was created for the individual, not the individual for the State. The State should consequently represent the individual whose creation it is. That it often does not, neither in its municipal, provincial or federal departments, is due to the fact that the citizen has not exercised his franchise or has not performed that duty wisely and honestly. The result is that the government becomes entrenched in power and largely independent of the

citizen through the latter's supineness or mercenary proclivities. Little by little the rights of the individual are being encroached upon. Protests become louder and louder as the voter feels the fetters that he has forged for himself becoming more and more galling. At last the populace, driven to desperation, breaks out in rebellion against the authority of its own making.

It is idle to talk about "government for the people, of the people, and by the people" if individual citizens do not give thought to civic questions and exercise their franchise intelligently. The question has often been asked why Catholic France elects a masonic government. The reason may be traced to the apathy of the French electorate in regard to political affairs and to the governmental control of the press which furnishes to the people only such information as is favorable to the party in power. We need not go so far afield to find proof to confirm our thesis. Only a few years ago the Catholic city of Montreal elected a masonic council, an instance of what lodge organization can accomplish when abetted by civic lethargy. Germany before the War afforded an example of almost absolute State control. Little by little the German citizen had relinquished his individual rights until he became at last merely a cog in the wheel of State. But Germany is not the only country where this process has been going on. In self-styled democracies we may witness how the arbitrary temper develops in a government that has gotten hold of the State motor together with plenty of money to buy gasoline. It is significant that the same tactics that were used in France to deceive the people are being employed elsewhere. The popular press has given place to journals of public information that contain only such matter as the authorities deem prudent to publish. Is it any wonder that there are evidences of revolt among the farming and laboring classes? But these very classes have themselves to blame. If they had realized that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty they would be enjoying more freedom today. If the individual farmer and laborer had exercised his franchise intelligently and honestly in the past he would not now be making so many vain and indignant protests against Prussian methods.

In connection with the above the present popular clamor for government ownership of public utilities affords an interesting study. One would naturally suppose that, since the people evince so little faith in present governments, they would be opposed to enlarging their sphere of action. The idea that prompts this movement is that the vested interests, in control of so many public works, are really the power behind the government. To remedy this evil it is planned to elect representatives of the common people, and to entrust them with the ownership and management of our railroads, telephones, electric light plants, etc. This is but an evidence of how the masses rush to extremes when at last the flood-gates of their indignation are let loose. It is an axiom of sound ethics that a government should own or control no industry that could be operated successfully by a private individual or by a corporate one, that is a company. In cases of doubt the decision should favor the individual whose rights are prior to those of the State. In Canada public ownership of railroads has not proved a success, while in the United States it is admitted to be a colossal failure, so much so that the successor of Mr. McAdoo has suggested that strong private companies be placed in charge of the work. Notwithstanding this, the chief plank in the popular platform is public ownership of everything from our railroads to our coal yards. The people seem to overlook the fact that private competition and initiative, if rightly controlled by law, afford better security to the citizen than the consigning of all these interests to a state of their own making which is amenable to no one and which may prove just as human as its predecessors.

It devolves upon every Catholic, as a duty of citizenship, to study this and other questions of the day so that his vote and influence may be on the side of sane legislation.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THAT AT a time like the present when Ireland's part in the late War is misinterpreted and underestimated, the bearded veteran of five wars who was a conspicuous figure at the

big soldiers' banquet in Toronto last week bore the name Michael Brophy should not have been without instruction to those present. The proportion of Irishmen in any gathering of British veterans is always large. In the Toronto gathering General Paul Pau, with the discerning eye of an old soldier, was quick to single out Michael Brophy and to do him signal honor.

THAT LUXURIOUS living and self-indulgence are not the highways to health and happiness has been demonstrated once more during the War. The pronouncement of the Lancet, England's chief medical journal, along this line has been noted in the Canadian press and cannot receive too much publicity. It is the old lesson that plain living makes for high thinking, and reasonable abstemiousness for bodily health and vigor. In this respect the world has much to learn from the past. Medieval simplicity added to modern methods of sanitation should produce the acme of physical well being, and add years to the average of human life.

"MUCH STRESS," says the Lancet, "has been put, and rightly, on war diseases. That way progress has been made. But there have also been war cures, and of these we have heard less. The disappearance of functional nervous disease among the civil population during the last four years is, however, a matter of general comment." Among diseases affected is the dreaded diabetes, so largely contributed to by modern indulgence. An investigating committee of the Vienna Medical Society found that all degrees of this malady were favorably affected by War conditions, "in males almost without exception, in females frequently, but by no means universally. . . . Whereas not one of 29 slight diabetics before the War could be regarded as cured, 83 out of 89 became engarfed under War conditions." War is unquestionably an evil, but does this not prove that its enforced abstemiousness brings some blessings in its train? There are no men more abstemious than the monks of La Trappe; there are few who live longer or are more free of disease. The lesson is worth learning.

IN DISCUSSING the vexed question of Imperial titles in the Dominion the Canada Law Times thinks that a wise compromise might be found by distinguishing between prefixes and affixes—that is, by retaining the letters K. C. B., K. C. M. G., C. B., and so forth (just as university graduates use the affixes B. A., M. A., LL. B., etc.) and by dropping the prefix "Sir." On the principle that it is fitting honorable public service should receive some sort of recognition there is much to be said for the Law Times' view. If adopted, however, why should such recognition not come solely from the Government of Canada rather than be sought for across the Atlantic? One result that will or at least should follow upon Canada's honorable part in the great conflict is increased respect for her own status as a people. In referring to Canadians as "colonial subjects"—a status long since outgrown—the Canada Law Times would seem to be living in the distant past.

IT IS ANNOUNCED that in the work of restoration of the devastated part of France, Norway, a neutral throughout the War, is to help by planting a belt of Norwegian forest trees.

France had always jealously guarded her forests and their ruthless destruction by the German armies was a blow felt scarcely less keenly than the destruction of her cathedrals. Much enthusiasm has on that account developed in France for the scheme, and the fact that, as proposed, it is to be carried out without imposing the slightest burden on France is honorable to the Government and people of Norway.

WORK ON the scheme is, it is further announced, to begin immediately, and the idea is to send a forestry party of fifty men, fully equipped with trees, tools, tents and stores, and to plant 250 acres annually for a period of five years. The tentative zone for planting is from Adrennes toward the Belgian frontier, behind Arras, a country fought over time and time again during the four years of war. In this district were some of the finest forests in France, and their reconstruction in accordance with French ideas will be a profound service to its inhabitants. In this connection the thought arises

irresistibly that as one of Canada's greatest contributions to the Allied cause during the progress of hostilities was in the department of forestry it would be fitting that she should have some part in the same service during the period of reconstruction now happily entered upon.

IN THIS matter of reconstruction in France it is gratifying to learn that at least some of the historic churches so viciously bombed by German artillery are not damaged beyond repair. The cathedral of Amiens for example, will, it is now definitely stated, live again. The nave is but a shell, from the empty organ case in the western gallery to the brick foundation. There are holes in the vaulting of the south choir aisle, and the once beautiful leaded glass hangs in ragged strips. There are no holes, however, in the main fabric, and some of the missing glass from the great windows has been preserved intact. The west front is entirely uninjured, and so are the nave and transepts of grey Picquigny stone, splendid in their simplicity and freedom from adornment. "No wonder," says a writer in the London Chronicle, "that Amiens and all France celebrates so hazardous an escape with joy. To the whole world, in fact, the destruction of Amiens cathedral would have been a loss hardly surpassed by the destruction of the Parthenon at Athens."

MOST REV. ARCHBISHOP MATHIEU'S SERMON

"WE ARE NOT BORN FOR HATRED, BUT FOR LOVE"

(Staff Correspondence of the Globe)

Ottawa, Feb. 28.—His Grace Archbishop O. E. Mathieu of Regina, Saskatchewan, delivered an impressive address in French at the funeral service in the Basilica. He took as his theme the great love of the Liberal Chieftain for his country, his great love for the unity of races in Canada, and strove to demonstrate that only through unity and mutual understanding will the country proceed in its walk toward full progress, happiness and prosperity.

"This illustrious statesman," said Archbishop Mathieu, "now lies before the altars of this church. He has now passed before the tribunal of God to account for his life, and impartial history shall tell the coming generations of his unquestionable qualities of both heart and mind."

"We mourn Laurier, but he is not wholly dead. His soul lives; it is now facing its God and Judge, and it begs not of us to pompously chant his qualities, but it begs of us the aims of a prayer, of a pious thought. The press, reviews, books, all have already told of Laurier's high qualities; all have united in a common accent of appreciation, and all have lauded his great merits."

HIS GREAT LOVE FOR HIS COUNTRY

"There is one great truth about Laurier," continued Archbishop Mathieu: "a truth that no one shall ever contest, that is his passionate love for his country. Yes, Laurier loved his Canada; he worked with never ceasing energy toward its prosperity and development, and it may be said with truth that Laurier spent his whole life, every day of his life, in the service of this country, which he always strove to make a nest of happiness for all who inhabited it. He was born in Quebec and loved his Province. He admired the kind and generous character of the Quebec habitant, he loved the honest soul of Quebec, the happiness of his patriarchal homes. For over half a century Laurier was the representative in the Canadian Commons of Quebec, that flower of France cultivated by Alibon. Laurier loved old Quebec, and old Quebec in turn dearly loved Laurier."

WHAT CANADA MEANT TO LAURIER

"But Laurier equally loved Canada at large. To him Canada was a land of promise, a land blessed by God, a land that held for him a secret of happiness equalled by no other soil in the world. He loved Canada, so rich in all the gifts of nature. He loved his country because it was his country, because, if I may quote from a noted author, it gave an idea of the splendor of heaven: 'Oh Lord, what then must Heaven be, that You gave such splendor to this world?' And this affection for his country, Laurier proved by his unending efforts to give it prosperity, happiness, wealth."

"And Laurier made it the goal of his life to work toward the welfare of his fellow-citizens. He well understood and strove to make it understood by all, that we are not born for hatred, but for love; that one must ever see the good in one's neighbor, and never credit him with ill will toward others. Laurier felt, and he strove to make all others feel, that one sole affection should bind all Canadians in a common good-will, in a common determination of bringing to all happiness through this Christian unity."

"Laurier believed this union feasible between fellow-citizens who have at heart the same motives of love, God and country; who have the self-same aspirations toward the triumph of good-will."