

The Catholic Record

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

Advertisements for teachers, situations, etc., 50 cents each insertion. Remittance must accompany the order. Where Catholic Record Box address is required send 10 cents to prepaid copy of postage upon copies.
Quotations and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 50 cents.

The Catholic Record has been approved and recommended by Archbishops Falconio and Sheil, and the Bishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough and Oshawa, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

In St. John, N. B., single copies may be purchased from Mrs. M. A. McGuire, 20 Main St. and John J. Dwyer.

In Sydney, N. S., single copies may be purchased at Murphy's Bookstore.

In Montreal, single copies may be purchased from J. Miller, 24 St. Catherine St. West.

In Ottawa, Ont., single copies may be purchased from J. O'Brien, 141 Nicholas St.

The following agents are authorized to receive subscriptions and canvass for The Catholic Record:

General Agents: M. J. Hagarty, Stephen V. James, Vincent J. Mack, Miss Jessie Doyle.
Resident Agents: Miss Bridget Saunders, 250-252, E. R. Costello, 220 8th Ave. W., Vancouver, B. C.; Miss Johnson, 310 Rochester St., Ottawa; Mrs. Geo. E. Smith, 2383 Main St., Montreal; R. H. Smith, 2383 Main St., Montreal; Anne Hogan, 307 Langside Street, Winnipeg, Man.

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 offends 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 euphemistically 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."

When so prominent a member as the Toronto Secretary of the Y. M. C. A. in a deliberate and official communication to the public press permits himself this cheap sneer at Papal infallibility he not only betrays the gross ignorance of the subject all too common amongst non-Catholics, but he reveals a good deal more plainly than he may have intended the quality of that fine spirit of "absolute impartiality" as well as his courteous regard for the "many Catholic friends and supporters" of the Y. M. C. A. And if Mr. Warburton can permit himself thus publicly to speak of Papal infallibility and "reactionary elements in organized religious life" we wonder how far the rank and file would have to go in private before such aspersions would come under the Y. M. C. A. prohibition of "attacks on any other communion."

Mr. Warburton does not believe in the infallibility of the Pope. No Catholic has any quarrel with him for that. He may not care enough about the matter to find out what is meant by the term. That again is his own affair. But when he undertakes to discuss or refer to a Catholic doctrine in the public press we have a right to expect that he will inform himself sufficiently to know what he is talking about. In that case ignorance is not an excuse for insolence. Any Catholic of his acquaintance could tell him that even if the Pope forbade Catholics to join the Y. M. C. A. for the reasons given in the press despatch which called forth Mr. Warburton's egotistic pronouncement, the matter would have nothing whatever to do with papal infallibility. The Pope might conceivably give an unwarranted decision on inadequate or misleading information. He might be entirely wrong—though Mr. Warburton has given ample proof that he is entirely right—without affecting in the slightest degree his prerogative of infallibility. That medium of information on the subject would have saved Mr. Warburton from giving way to the temptation of his pitiful gibe at Papal infallibility.

The smug assumption of "progressiveness" in the reference to "reactionary elements" is characteristic of the Y. M. C. A. mentality.

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:

An Associated Press Cable says that the Holy Office at Rome has issued a decree asking Roman Catholic bishops to watch the Young Men's Christian Association. The association is described as "professing absolute freedom of thought in religious matters." It is said to "foster indifference and apathy to the Catholic religion in the minds of its adherents" and "it corrupts the faith of youths."

Unless it is borne in mind that the Pope as the supreme pastor of the faithful is here solicitous about safeguarding the faith of Catholics, that it is to Catholic membership exclusively his remarks apply, his position will be easily misunderstood.

A few years ago a Y. M. C. A. official of long standing in Chicago gave it as his experience that the atmosphere and influence of the Y. M. C. A. tended to lead Catholics away from the practice of their religion, which is the exact meaning if not the exact language of the Holy Office.

Indeed Mr. Jenkins himself declares:

"The definite religious work conducted in the Young Men's Christian Association consists largely of Bible study, in which young men are advised and urged to study the Bible and are given the utmost freedom in drawing their own religious inspiration directly therefrom."

This alleged Protestant doctrine, and a highly commendable object for the Young Men's Christian Association to promote amongst Protestant young men. But it is Protestant doctrine, the doctrine of Private Judgment, which is the very antithesis of the Catholic teaching with regard to the ultimate rule of faith. Of this we shall have something to say next week.

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 faithfully 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 occurrences of the present British tyranny in Ireland.

Hammer Greenwood's shameless denials of notorious facts have ceased even to excite contempt. Alleged "Sinn Féin plots" to blow up Lloyd George, steal 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 Tans ruffians armed 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. Hammer Greenwood's repeated denials of all Government responsibility for 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."

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 powers 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. 3rd, 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 no furniture. No foodstuffs, corn or hay were destroyed."

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 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.

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

That public decency might find suitable expression through the crown attorney was the gentle hint of Magistrate Jelfs who remarked to that effect 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 Eljah and his brother were witnesses.

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 \$1.50 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 principle underlying such laws is thus stated by the "Commission on Uniformity of Provincial Labor Laws": "We approve the principle of a minimum wage for women and girls and recommend that a competent authority be created in each province in the Dominion to establish a minimum wage adequate to maintain self-support for women and girls and such authority shall be empowered to fix the hours of employment for such women and girls not already provided for by legislation, and further recommend that such hours of employment should not exceed 48 per week, except of employees engaged in domestic or agricultural employment." (Labor Gazette, May 1920, p. 546)

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."

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, made use of by Socialistic demagogues as a convenient *bête-noir* 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 corporate 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 accretes 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 combinations 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 those 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, as 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 as one 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 anticatholics 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 resolved 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 Mollereux, 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 colleagues, 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.

KENNETH, the notorious English bigot, 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 shanty 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 Kenneth 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-