

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum. United States and Europe—\$2.50. Publisher & Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.D. Editors: James T. Foley, B.A. Associate Editor—H. F. Mackintosh. Manager—Robert M. Burns.

LONDON, SATURDAY, JAN. 15, 1921

Y. M. C. A. "FRANKLY PROTESTANT"

In a recent communication to the press Mr. George A. Warburton, General Secretary of the Toronto Y. M. C. A., says: "The Young Men's Christian Association has never pretended to be anything but Protestant in its control and in its fundamental purpose."

Those of us who remember the appeals for Y. M. C. A. funds for building and maintenance can hardly fail to recall the emphasis placed on the "purely non-sectarian" character of the Young Men's Christian Association and its work. It is hardly necessary to say that we do not here refer to the war work of the Association. Illustrative of this claim is the experience of a parish priest, who in pre-war days was called upon and invited to contribute by a Y. M. C. A. collector. The priest politely pointed out that the Association was a Protestant organization and as such was hardly one that could claim his support.

The collector promptly and emphatically denied the allegation; whereupon the priest produced the constitution of the Association and invited the collector to read. On doing so he professed to be astonished at the fact that Catholics, like Mohammedans and Jews, were peremptorily excluded not only from all office in the organization but even from voting for a Protestant for any official position. Probably he was honestly as astonished as he professed to be. He admitted at once that in the circumstances to ask Catholics to contribute to an Association which debarred them from membership was an impudent proceeding and inconsistent with Protestant self-respect. He had been deceived by the emphatic and repeated declarations of absolute non-sectarianism or undenominationalism.

Now, after this fact has been pointed out hundreds of times by individuals and by the Catholic press comes Mr. Warburton's sweeping admission that: "The Young Men's Christian Association has never pretended to be anything but Protestant in its control and in its fundamental purpose."

"Has never pretended!" Turn up the newspaper files of any city when a Y. M. C. A. "drive" was on, and you will find no admission that the Association is "frankly Protestant" as the Globe appropriately headlines Mr. Warburton's communication; but always and everywhere that the Association is purely non-sectarian. Even with the belated "frank admission" Mr. Warburton puts the old false claim in a new but not less disingenuous dress:

"It serves Protestants and Catholics with absolute impartiality and numbers among its friends and supporters many of that faith." "It serves"—note the adroit evasion of the old charge which had to be so often repeated but which is now "frankly" admitted, that the Y. M. C. A. is "Protestant in its control and in its fundamental purpose."

The attempted reassertion of the old claim of absolute non-sectarianism is not so adroit. In fact it is as clumsy as it is disingenuous. We reproduce it here that our readers may recognize the old non-sectarian claim in the new dress which we may expect it henceforth to wear:

"Its avowed aim is to lead young men and boys to become disciples of and followers of Jesus Christ. But in its operations it everywhere offers its practical service to young men and boys regardless of their religious training, belief or affiliations. It serves Protestants and Catholics with absolute impartiality, and numbers among its friends and supporters many of that faith. While its responsible relation is to the Protestant Church, it does not permit attacks upon any other communion, nor does it attempt to proselytize adherents of the Roman Catholic faith."

Its avowed aim is therefore religious. Catholics recognize and can recognize no religious authority other than that of the Church founded by Jesus Christ on the rock of Peter and his successors. No intelligent Catholic, moderately well instructed in his religion, can any longer feel free to accept what is emphatically called associate membership in an organization whose avowed aim is religious and whose fundamental purpose is Protestant. No self-respecting Catholic would wish to do so.

During the War, at least in the case of one prominent official, the Y. M. C. A. let down the bar against Unitarians. Unitarians, of course, deny absolutely the divinity of Christ. Newspapers commended this evidence of broad-mindedness, and condemned the exclusion of Unitarians as reactionary and absurd. But we nowhere saw a suggestion that the bar against Catholics should be removed. Perhaps the fact that in many cities of the United States Catholics outnumber all other professing Christians combined is a deterring influence, suggesting the loss of Protestant control and failure of the fundamental Protestant purpose. At any rate the bar is there. This is now openly acknowledged. And the reason is openly admitted to be that the Y. M. C. A. is a frankly Protestant religious association.

Let us hear Mr. Warburton to the end: "I do not wish to express any opinion as to the reported Papal decree. If the Pope has reason to fear the influence of such contacts as those afforded young men generally in the Young Men's Christian Association, his action may be an evidence of his infallibility, but so far as it represents reactionary elements in organized religious life, it will have but very slight effect upon the practical relations of the Young Men's Christian Association to its whole task, offering and rendering service to the entire young manhood of the community."

Mr. Edward Jenkins, General Secretary of the London Y. M. C. A., has written a letter to the Free Press in which he courteously explains the Y. M. C. A. "attitude on those points on which criticism has arisen" without any of Mr. Warburton's insulting flings at papal infallibility and reactionary elements.

In his opening paragraph Mr. Jenkins thus states the criticism to which he refers: "Although it is not yet possible to identify any persons actually engaged in attacks, the military governor is of the opinion that it is impossible to effect preparations for such attacks without the knowledge of many local residents, who are therefore held guilty at least to the extent of having failed to give information to the authorities."

Of course there is nothing new in this except the open avowal of this outrageous subversion of British traditions of law and liberty as a settled government policy. It would be interesting to see what Canadian newspapers, which take all this as a matter of course in Ireland, would have to say if a similar rule were applied to the homes in the vicinity of the burglaries and robberies now almost of daily occurrence in one or other of our Canadian cities.

Just as a reminder to indignant readers that decent English sentiment utterly condemns organized lynch law in Ireland, we quote the London Daily News which condemns the military destruction of houses near Cork as "a savage outrage on human decency." Referring to the suspected guilty knowledge of the unfortunate victims the Daily News continues: "Why were they not arrested? If there was no case against them, this monstrous act cannot be excused by anything that General MacCreedy or Sir Hamar Greenwood may say as to its legality in the interpretation of the almost unlimited power of martial law. Let us not omit the fact, in order to show the tender solicitude of the official incendiaries, that the furniture was first removed and that no damage was done to foodstuffs and hay. How grateful the tenants will be for this thoughtful consideration as they sit by the roadside among their useless household goods and watch the smouldering ruins of their homes!"

It would appear that in London, at least on the day following the "savage outrage on human decency," that it was given out the furniture was removed. Even this poor mitigation of the savagery did not actually occur. In the New York Times special cable from Cork, Jan. 8th, the following paragraph is quoted from the statement issued by the military authorities and signed by the Brigade Major of Cork: "Previous to the burnings notice was served on the persons affected, giving them one hour to clear out valuables, but not furniture. No foodstuffs, corn or hay were destroyed."

Mr. Jenkins here confirms Mr. Warburton's unequivocal admission that the Young Men's Christian Association is Protestant in its fundamental purpose. If under the religious influence of the Y. M. C. A. Catholic youths are led to substitute private judgment for the teaching authority of the Church, then their Catholic faith is corrupted and they become Protestants in fact if not in name.

For the Y. M. C. A. as a frankly Protestant Association openly professing Protestant principles and promoting Protestant aims we have nothing but admiration and good will. But as professing to serve Catholics equally with Protestants we think the official admissions quoted above amply justify the solicitude and the strictures of the Holy Father. Bounded by his office watchfully to safeguard the Catholic faith he quite naturally calls upon the Bishops to see to it that Catholic youths are not misled into associations whose atmosphere and influence tend to weaken or destroy that priceless heritage.

IRELAND'S HAPPY NEW YEAR During the time of passion and prejudice deliberately inflamed for purposes, when reckless exaggeration of what was fundamentally true and ingenious invention of gross calumny were considered an evidence of patriotism, nothing was ever attributed to the German rule of barbarous African tribes to exceed the everyday occurrence of the present British tyranny in Ireland.

Hamar Greenwood's shameless denials of notorious facts have seemed even to excite contempt. Alleged "Sinn Fein plots" to blow up Lloyd George, et al the crown jewels, etc., etc., deceive only those whose unreasoning prejudices crave for that sort of stuff.

On the other hand are the hard facts of ruthless tyranny in Ireland. Enough of these transpire to enable us to gauge the nature and extent of the organized terrorism.

On New Year's day, not by Black and Tan ruffians crazed with pillaged whiskey, not by soldiers broken away from military discipline, but by the deliberate order of responsible military authority, the houses of five families in the neighborhood of Cork were deliberately burned "between 3 p. m. and 6 p. m. on Jan. 1st" because, ferocious, the military authorities suspected them of knowledge of an ambush which occurred in the vicinity of their homes.

This is now the openly avowed policy. Hamar Greenwood's repeated denials of or even knowledge of such outrages heretofore can now be judged at their true value. They prove just one thing—the Irish Secretary's effrontery and mendacity. On Jan 7th Dublin Castle made this official announcement: "Although it is not yet possible to identify any persons actually engaged in attacks, the military governor is of the opinion that it is impossible to effect preparations for such attacks without the knowledge of many local residents, who are therefore held guilty at least to the extent of having failed to give information to the authorities."

Magistrate Jelfs, whose robust sanity and good sense has shown itself repeatedly in such cases, remarked to Inspector Sturdy: "This is not the approved method of securing convictions against those accused of breaches of the O. T. A., although the Government approves of it."

A LIVING MINIMUM WAGE FOR WOMEN The laws relating to a minimum wage for working women in Canada are provincial, not Federal. They are of very recent date. The first step was taken by Alberta in 1917, which inserted a clause in the Factories Act of that year establishing a flat minimum wage of \$1.00 per shift for all employees covered by the Act, except apprentices who were to receive \$1.00 per shift. In 1918, the first minimum wage laws for women were passed by Manitoba and British Columbia, in the following year by Quebec and Saskatchewan, and in 1920 by Nova Scotia and Ontario.

That public decency might find suitable expression through the crown attorney was the gentle hint of Magistrate Jelfs who remarked to that official that he had known Crown officers who had refused to act when they found their witnesses were men of bad reputation. Acting on the hint Crown Attorney Bowly said that he would drop the cases in which Elijah and his brother were witnesses.

A CHANGE OF SYSTEM NECESSARY By THE OBSERVER The beginnings of human industry were very simple. The tilling and cropping of the soil and the raising of sheep and cattle were the earliest occupations of mankind. Society was simple; the range of travel and association was very limited. Buying and selling were simple and direct processes; and men met face to face in almost all their transactions. Procedure was not at all complicated. Barter, or exchange, of one commodity for another, was the most common form of business dealing.

Business gradually grew more complex as races and peoples increased the volume of their transactions and extended their field of business operations. When the people of one country began to trade with the people of far distant countries, the original method of actual exchange, hand to hand, of one kind of goods for another was at first employed; and the caravans which crept from Europe into Asia and from Asia into Europe were accompanied by their owners; and they bargained, bought and sold on the spot, in person.

After a time, business got beyond that stage; and credit became necessary, and so banking was originated; and bills of exchange came into use. Large accumulations of capital were found convenient; and larger development of business followed; leading in turn, to still larger accumulations of capital.

But, for centuries and centuries, business continued to be done individually. The trader was an individual; or a few individuals in partnership were a trading firm, but with individual responsibility for all the losses and obligations of the business.

The incorporated company is a comparatively modern thing; and was, in its inception, nothing more than a larger partnership, the individual responsibility being, as yet, preserved. The company grew in size; and the number of individuals belonging to it was in many cases so great that most of them could keep no supervision whatever over the business transacted, and were obliged to leave to a few the direction of the company's affairs. In England, men who had invested small sums in such companies, in some cases found themselves saddled with immense losses which took from them all their property and money.

It was then seen that if the company idea was not to be abandoned, companies must be made safer for investors; or else there would soon be no one willing to go into them; and thus came into existence the limited liability company. There is practically no other sort of company today in the British Empire or the United States. Occasionally one sees the word company used as a firm name for what is really a partnership of individuals or merely an individual; but practically all combinations of individuals which are called companies, are incorporated under the law; and in them the liability of individuals is limited to the amount of the shares they held.

This limitation of individual responsibility was wise and necessary; but it has had some curious effects. A company is now a mere legal entity or person. "It has," as has been wittily said, "no body to be kicked nor soul to be damned." This change in the nature of the incorporated company has made it an artificial thing; and its artificiality is, on the one hand, made a cloak for the doing of things which individuals would not care to do under their own names; and, on the other hand, is made use of by Socialistic demagogues as a convenient tête-à-tête or bogey, against which it is easy to use tactics which they might not be ready to use against individuals.

Unfortunately, this situation has been aggravated by the course of corporatist development in the last thirty years. The company is a combination of individuals; and I have just noted that the company became an artificial thing, putting off the individual responsibility; and thus it lost the human touch which almost always accedes a human response. But about thirty years ago it was seen that greater industrial and commercial and financial power could be wielded by means of combinations of companies. And so the Trust was introduced to the world.

It would be unfair to say that the motives of those who formed the first of these combine of industry and finance, were wholly bad. They saw, of course, great wealth and power for themselves; but they also saw the possibility of great operations in industry and commerce, through which, by reason of the scale on which production should be done, costs would be much less, and prices lower.

But the result has followed which was to be apprehended: The benefits to speculators and manipulators have been secured; but the benefits which ought to have come to the general public have been prevented or deflected. Now, if the man in the street feels that a company "has no body to be kicked and no soul to be damned," what can he be expected to feel about a combination of companies? The more you merge or consolidate companies, the less the man who has business to do will realize that, after all, human beings own these companies by owning the shares in them; and, on the other hand, the less the individual shareholder will realize that, after all, he has some responsibility to the human beings his company deals with; even though his responsibility for the company's debts is limited by law.

It is to be feared that those reciprocal responsibilities are not likely to be realized; nor, so far as the present system of company capitalization and direction goes, is it very practicable for the thousands of human beings who own shares, to come into touch with the company's employees and customers. For these and other reasons, I have come to the conclusion that the present company system is in sight of its end. It has done much that is good; but it has become, to an unreasonable extent, a means of enriching a few, whilst it has got out of human touch with the many.

Its logical successor is the co-operative company, in which employees and customers shall be co-operators. This system is capable of being applied at once to most of the world's business affairs. We cannot go on, as a nation, safely, with employers and employees divided into two hostile camps. They must, so far as possible, be brought into one camp. Co-operation can do that. And it can do more than that; it can bring in the consumer too.

NOTES AND COMMENTS AS INDICATIVE of a reactionary movement among anticlericals in France is cited the conversion of an ex-Mayor of Pau, in the Pyrenees. This man had been a bitter foe to everything Catholic but has now made his peace with the Church, and received solemn conditional baptism. The event has created a profound impression all through France.

ANOTHER INDICATION of a reaction in the return of religious orders to France. The Trappist monks of the Abbey of Our Lady of Compassion, in Devonshire, who have lived in England since the expulsion of religious by decree of the French Government, have now returned, or are about to return to their old home, at Mollersate, near Nantes. Several of these monks served in the French Army through the War, and one of their brethren, Father Gabriel, was killed in action.

STILL ANOTHER sign pointing the same way is that according to a French priest, writing in the Journal de Geneve, an important group of the Dapines on the Left in the French Chamber have promised to support an attempt on the part of their Catholic colleague, to put forward a Bill for the restitution of some of the property of which the clergy had been despoiled under the Law of Separation. That France owes this measure of reparation to the clergy every page of War-history testifies.

KENNETT, the notorious English big game, has proven in his own person that fanaticism pays. At the outset of his unsavory career he was an obscure bookseller, having his establishment in a back-row shabby off one of the London thoroughfares. Now he has palatial quarters in St. Paul's Churchyard, the publishing centre of the city. His latest achievement in the publishing line, "The Jesuits," is said to outdo all previous efforts in that direction. Evidently there is still a considerable element that feeds on refuse of that description. At any rate Kennett appears to have found it exceedingly lucrative. And therein probably lies the motive of it all.

THE RECENT death of Archbishop Maguire of Glasgow removed a pre-

vious conviction of burning a barn and of highway robbery is no bar to employment as a whiskey informer if we are to judge by the confession of one of these officials in Hamilton last week.

Elijah Lickers confessed that he was guilty and convicted of those small delinquencies before joining the fighting forces of the noble army of uplift.

CATHOLIC SOCIAL ACTION In this week's issue of the CATHOLIC RECORD we publish two important articles which will repay serious perusal. In the article which is reproduced from the Labor number of Social Welfare is given the historic background which must be fully realized before intelligent Catholic study of social questions can be made. In a united Christendom where the influence of the Catholic Church was all-pervading on the civilization that was her own special creation, industry like everything else was as a matter of course Christianized.

Dr. O'Gorman's sermon, besides setting forth general principles in the light of Catholic teaching, makes an eminently practical application of them to conditions here and now existing.

The serious student of social questions, whether Catholic or non-Catholic, will find in these two articles not only light on the social action of the Catholic Church but direction and guidance for this most necessary and fruitful field of social study.

THE METHODS OF LEGISLATIVE UPLIFT Previous convictions of burning a barn and of highway robbery is no bar to employment as a whiskey informer if we are to judge by the confession of one of these officials in Hamilton last week.

Elijah Lickers confessed that he was guilty and convicted of those small delinquencies before joining the fighting forces of the noble army of uplift.

Magistrate Jelfs, whose robust sanity and good sense has shown itself repeatedly in such cases, remarked to Inspector Sturdy: "This is not the approved method of securing convictions against those accused of breaches of the O. T. A., although the Government approves of it."

A LIVING MINIMUM WAGE FOR WOMEN The laws relating to a minimum wage for working women in Canada are provincial, not Federal. They are of very recent date. The first step was taken by Alberta in 1917, which inserted a clause in the Factories Act of that year establishing a flat minimum wage of \$1.00 per shift for all employees covered by the Act, except apprentices who were to receive \$1.00 per shift. In 1918, the first minimum wage laws for women were passed by Manitoba and British Columbia, in the following year by Quebec and Saskatchewan, and in 1920 by Nova Scotia and Ontario.

The Ontario Act applies to all female laborers apart from farm laborers and domestic servants. A Minimum Wage Board is established by the Act with authority to investigate conditions and determine a minimum wage. The minimum wage may vary according to locality, as living may be cheaper in a large city than in a small town. Lower than the minimum wage may be given in all provinces, save Alberta, to apprentices or physically defective employees, and in Ontario, also to part time employees.

The minimum weekly wage fixed by the Manitoba Board in 1918 for experienced adult women in retail stores was \$12. The Minimum Wage Board of British Columbia fixed in 1919 a minimum weekly wage for experienced adult women which varied from \$15.50 in the fishing industry to \$10.89 for theatre ushers. In Saskatchewan in the same year, the minimum weekly wage fixed by the Board for experienced adult women varied from \$15 in millinery shops to \$14 in other groups of occupations covered by the regulations. The Ontario Minimum Wage Board has only recently been formed. New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island lack legislation on this subject.

It will be noted that underlying principle of the minimum wage laws is not to determine how much the employer can afford to pay, or how much the employee deserves (the latter is a "fair wage" and is frequently much in excess of the minimum wage). The thing to be determined is how much does the worker require for a living wage. In the case of an adult man, this means a family living wage, that is enough to support a normal sized family; in the case of a woman, a personal living wage. The principle of a living wage though introduced into Canadian legislation only in 1917 has long been a familiar one in Catholic Schools. It was thus stated by Pope Leo XIII. in his Encyclical "Rerum Novarum" (15 May, 1891): "There is a dictate of nature more ancient and more imperious than any bargain between man and man, that the remuneration must be sufficient to support the wage-earner in reasonable and frugal comfort. If through necessity or fear of a worse evil the workman accepts harder conditions, because an employer or contractor will give him no better, he is a victim of fraud and injustice."

Magistrate Jelfs, whose robust sanity and good sense has shown itself repeatedly in such cases, remarked to Inspector Sturdy: "This is not the approved method of securing convictions against those accused of breaches of the O. T. A., although the Government approves of it."

A CHANGE OF SYSTEM NECESSARY By THE OBSERVER The beginnings of human industry were very simple. The tilling and cropping of the soil and the raising of sheep and cattle were the earliest occupations of mankind. Society was simple; the range of travel and association was very limited. Buying and selling were simple and direct processes; and men met face to face in almost all their transactions. Procedure was not at all complicated. Barter, or exchange, of one commodity for another, was the most common form of business dealing.

Business gradually grew more complex as races and peoples increased the volume of their transactions and extended their field of business operations. When the people of one country began to trade with the people of far distant countries, the original method of actual exchange, hand to hand, of one kind of goods for another was at first employed; and the caravans which crept from Europe into Asia and from Asia into Europe were accompanied by their owners; and they bargained, bought and sold on the spot, in person.

After a time, business got beyond that stage; and credit became necessary, and so banking was originated; and bills of exchange came into use. Large accumulations of capital were found convenient; and larger development of business followed; leading in turn, to still larger accumulations of capital.

But, for centuries and centuries, business continued to be done individually. The trader was an individual; or a few individuals in partnership were a trading firm, but with individual responsibility for all the losses and obligations of the business.

The incorporated company is a comparatively modern thing; and was, in its inception, nothing more than a larger partnership, the individual responsibility being, as yet, preserved. The company grew in size; and the number of individuals belonging to it was in many cases so great that most of them could keep no supervision whatever over the business transacted, and were obliged to leave to a few the direction of the company's affairs. In England, men who had invested small sums in such companies, in some cases found themselves saddled with immense losses which took from them all their property and money.

It was then seen that if the company idea was not to be abandoned, companies must be made safer for investors; or else there would soon be no one willing to go into them; and thus came into existence the limited liability company. There is practically no other sort of company today in the British Empire or the United States. Occasionally one sees the word company used as a firm name for what is really a partnership of individuals or merely an individual; but practically all combinations of individuals which are called companies, are incorporated under the law; and in them the liability of individuals is limited to the amount of the shares they held.

This limitation of individual responsibility was wise and necessary; but it has had some curious effects. A company is now a mere legal entity or person. "It has," as has been wittily said, "no body to be kicked nor soul to be damned." This change in the nature of the incorporated company has made it an artificial thing; and its artificiality is, on the one hand, made a cloak for the doing of things which individuals would not care to do under their own names; and, on the other hand, is made use of by Socialistic demagogues as a convenient tête-à-tête or bogey, against which it is easy to use tactics which they might not be ready to use against individuals.

Unfortunately, this situation has been aggravated by the course of corporatist development in the last thirty years. The company is a combination of individuals; and I have just noted that the company became an artificial thing, putting off the individual responsibility; and thus it lost the human touch which almost always accedes a human response. But about thirty years ago it was seen that greater industrial and commercial and financial power could be wielded by means of combinations of companies. And so the Trust was introduced to the world.

It would be unfair to say that the motives of those who formed the first of these combine of industry and finance, were wholly bad. They saw, of course, great wealth and power for themselves; but they also saw the possibility of great operations in industry and commerce, through which, by reason of the scale on which production should be done, costs would be much less, and prices lower.

But the result has followed which was to be apprehended: The benefits to speculators and manipulators have been secured; but the benefits which ought to have come to the general public have been prevented or deflected. Now, if the man in the street feels that a company "has no body to be kicked and no soul to be damned," what can he be expected to feel about a combination of companies? The more you merge or consolidate companies, the less the man who has business to do will realize that, after all, human beings own these companies by owning the shares in them; and, on the other hand, the less the individual shareholder will realize that, after all, he has some responsibility to the human beings his company deals with; even though his responsibility for the company's debts is limited by law.

It is to be feared that those reciprocal responsibilities are not likely to be realized; nor, so far as the present system of company capitalization and direction goes, is it very practicable for the thousands of human beings who own shares, to come into touch with the company's employees and customers. For these and other reasons, I have come to the conclusion that the present company system is in sight of its end. It has done much that is good; but it has become, to an unreasonable extent, a means of enriching a few, whilst it has got out of human touch with the many.