

The Catholic Record

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

Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted, etc., 50 cents each insertion. Remittance to accompany the order. Where CATHOLIC RECORD Box address is required send 10 cents to cover expense of postage upon replies.

Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 50 cents.

Approved and recommended by Archbishops Palumbo and Sheil, late Apostolic Delegates in 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. Hearn, Vincent B. Cox, and Miss Jessie Doyle; resident agents: Mrs. W. E. Smith, Halifax; Miss B. B. Sanders, Sydney; Miss T. Hogan, Winnipeg; Mrs. J. J. Kelly, 2525 5th Ave. West, Vancouver, B. C.; Miss Shannon, 211 Boscawen St., Ottawa; Miss Ross, 145 D'Aquila St., Quebec; Mrs. Geo. W. Smith, 2508 St. Urbain St., Montreal; M. J. Merle, Montreal; B. F. Yates, Leirist, Sask.; and E. J. Murphy, Box 125, Saskatoon.
In St. John, N. B., single copies may be purchased from Mrs. M. A. McLean, 140 Main Street, and John J. Dwyer.
In Sydney, N. S., single copies may be purchased at Murphy's Bookstore.
In Montreal single copies may be purchased from J. Milroy, 241 St. Catherine St. West.

LONDON, SATURDAY, MAY 17, 1919

CATHOLICS AND THE BIBLE

That the Bible is the inspired Word of God is happily a belief common to Catholics and Protestants alike. Prescinding now from the fact that Protestants regard certain books of the Bible as apocryphal; prescinding also from the fact that many Protestant scholars, even doctors in Israel, have become so infected with German rationalism that for them the whole doctrine of inspiration is vitiated; still it is a matter for joy and gratitude to all Catholics to recognize that numberless sincere Protestants are united with them in that great fundamental truth, the inspiration of Holy Scriptures. This is something for which we should be grateful to God; it is a truth that should be brought out and emphasized. "Within My Parish" is a little volume of personal experiences and reflections of a scholarly and zealous priest; this passage therefrom is suggestive of many things we need not enlarge upon, and has an obvious bearing on the matter of which we are treating:

"My relations with the various Protestant ministers in town have been and are cordial and enduring. I have not been above learning from them in some matters of practical administration, and I like to think that my contact with them may have been conducive to the breaking down of a few of their inherited prejudices. In our discussions we most often take our stand upon opinions or doctrines held in common, rather than upon those about which we differ. I think no greater mistake has been made by Catholic controversialists than the drawing of the invidious distinction between the Catholic religion as true and Protestantism as false. The distinction really to be observed is between the Catholic religion as true and Protestantism as partly true. There is, as you perceive, a wide difference in the methods of attack. One, I fear, has served but to alienate further from the Church many good and sincere people; the other may be rendered capable of drawing many to her."

So little is this great and consoling truth emphasized that often non-Catholics are surprised to find that the teaching of the Catholic Church on the Word of God is even more explicit and definite than their own. It may be well to give here the dogmatic pronouncement of the Vatican Council (Sess. III. cap. II.) on the inspiration of the Bible:

"These books are held by the Church as sacred and canonical, not as having been composed by merely human labor and afterwards approved by her authority, nor merely because they contain revelation without error, but because, written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, they have God for their author, and have been transmitted to the Church as such."

And Leo XIII. in 1893, in his Encyclical on The Study of Holy Scripture, reaffirmed the constant teaching of the Catholic Church in the face of the pseudo-science of Higher Criticism and the ever-spreading German rationalism, in these words:

"The Holy Ghost Himself, by His supernatural power, stirred up and impelled the Biblical writers to write, and assisted them while writing in such a manner that they conceived in their minds exactly, and determined to commit to writing faithfully, and render in exact language, with infallible truth, all that God commanded and nothing else; without that, God would not be the author of Scripture in its entirety."

Nearly five hundred years ago the Council of Trent pronounced anathema against those who denied that the Bible and "every part thereof" was the inspired Word of God.

But even those Protestants who know that not only do Catholics believe that the Bible is the inspired

Word of God but who know, also, that the Church throws over the Holy Scriptures the irrefragable protection of Catholic dogma, still have the impression, sometimes the honest conviction, that Catholics are not allowed by the Church to read the Bible.

It is true that the Church as the divinely appointed guardian and interpreter of Holy Scripture has always forbidden the reading of misleading and erroneous versions of the Bible; nor can she allow any one, even with good-will and a desire to be accurate, to usurp her functions with regard to the written Word of God.

But it is strange that the fable about our being forbidden to read the Scriptures should have survived Leo XIII's public urging on all Catholics to read the Scriptures, and his granting an indulgence to those who for at least a quarter of an hour daily, read the Gospels. Nor is this a new departure in the practice of the Church.

The following Letter of His Holiness Pius Sixth, to the Most Rev. Anthony Martin, later Archbishop of Florence, on his Translation of the Holy Bible into Italian, shows the benefits which the Church considers the faithful may reap from their having the Holy Scriptures in their own language. This Letter until recently was used in the preface to the Catholic English version of the Bible; more recent publishers have substituted a preface of no particular value.

POPE PIUS THE SIXTH

Beloved Son, Health and Apostolical Benediction.

At a time that a vast number of bad books, which most grossly attack Catholic Religion, are circulated, even among the unlearned, to the great destruction of souls, you judge exceedingly well that the faithful should be excited to the reading of the Holy Scriptures. For these are the most abundant sources which ought to be left open to everyone, to draw from them purity of morals and of doctrine, to eradicate the errors which are so widely disseminated in these corrupt times. This you have reasonably effected, as you declare, by publishing the Sacred Writings in the language of your country, suitable to every one's capacity; especially when you show and set forth, that you have added explanatory notes, which being extracted from the Holy Fathers, preclude every possible danger of abuse. Thus you have not swerved either from the laws of the Congregation of the Index, or from the Constitution published on this subject by Benedict XIV. that immortal Pope, or predecessor in the Pontificate, and formerly, when We held a place near his person, our excellent Master in Ecclesiastical learning; circumstances which We mention as honorable to us. We therefore applaud your eminent learning, joined with your extraordinary piety, and We return you our due acknowledgment for the books you have transmitted to Us, and which when convenient We will read over. In the meantime, as a token of our Pontifical benevolence, receive our Apostolic benediction which to you, beloved Son, We very affectionately impart. Given at Rome on the Calends of April, 1778, the fourth year of our Pontificate.

To our beloved Son,
Anthony Martin, at Turin.
(Sd.) PHILIP BUONAMICI,
Latin Secretary.

So far, then, as the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures are concerned, or even the great profit to be derived from reading them, Protestants who have retained their faith in God's Word and Catholics are at one.

Where we are at variance, distinctly and radically at variance, is when our Protestant friends claim that each individual has the right to interpret the Sacred Writings for himself, and is assured of the grace and guidance of the Holy Ghost in so doing. Leaving aside for the moment the flagrant contradiction between the Protestant theory and Protestant practice and experience in this matter, and leaving aside, also, the warning that Holy Writ itself gives, that the unlearned and unstable often wrest the Scriptures to their own destruction, we may profitably abandon the field of controversy and the warring influences of religious prejudice and consider this question in the light of calm reason and human experience.

Available to every one interested in or charged with responsibility with regard to the maintenance of schools is the School Act. Profitable and useful it is to read the law on the subject and be well informed as to one's duties and responsibilities. But disputes arise even in school matters. And though there is nothing so hard to be understood in the law, in no civilized community on earth would the principle of private

interpretation of the school law be permitted. Assurances of settling such disputes right reason and uniform human experience demand that tribunals of competent jurisdiction interpret the law, apply it to the facts of the case and settle the dispute.

With regard to disputes over property rights private judgment would allow as a divine right to each disputant to interpret the law in his own favor and pass on the quarrel to his children and his children's children. Reason, common sense and universal human experience have decided that this would be folly; competent tribunals decide the question. No where and at no time so far as knowledge or record of the human race goes back was the principle of private judgment applied to civil law. It is contrary to the common sense and common experience of mankind. No one but a fool or an anarchist would advocate this principle so far as civil law and order are concerned.

Human experience is quite as clear in its testimony that private judgment is the principle of anarchy in matters spiritual.

Our non-Catholic friends if they could rid themselves of preconceived notions and obfuscating prejudice would be compelled to admit that the Catholic principle of authoritative interpretation of the Bible is at least in accord with right reason and that the alternative principle of private judgment runs counter to the whole experience of the whole human race, and to the common consent of mankind.

THE CONSPIRACY AGAINST BISHOP BUDKA

To understand the preposterous charges against Ruthenian Catholics and Bishop Budka it may be useful and illuminating to recall the efforts of certain anti-Catholic zealots to proselytize these people some years ago. They actually seduced some young Ruthenians from the faith of their fathers and succeeded in instilling into them such diabolical hatred for the Catholic religion and such utter disregard for all considerations of truth and decency and reverence that they induced these young apostates to pose as priests and go through a blasphemous travesty of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, according to the Ruthenian rite, with the deliberate and utterly shameless intention of cruelly deceiving these simple Christians and finally seducing them from their faith. There were Presbyterians in Canada whose stomachs would not stand such nauseating zeal in the perversion of Ruthenian Catholics.

Never had the words of Christ a more apt and accurate application than to these Canadian proselytizers: "Woe unto you Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites; because you go round about sea and land to make one proselyte; and when he is made you make him the child of hell twofold more than yourselves."

Hypocrites! Did any one ever conceive of such hypocrisy as the bogus masses of the Protestant (?) Ruthenian converts?

These people whose faith is destroyed, whose conscience is perverted, who have been taught that blasphemy, irreverence, hypocrisy and deception are enlightened and progressive ways of serving God, are not likely to stop at anything. So they make the utterly preposterous charges that Bishop Budka and his priests are inculcating Bolshevism! The Catholic Church as every one knows is the greatest support of lawful authority and the greatest bulwark against Bolshevism amongst Canada's foreign population. The would-be Ruthenian leaders know this better than any one else; so they would strike at the Shepherd of the flock, relying on insane and unreasoning prejudice to support their foul and baseless accusations.

Lieutenant R. Keyman, who appears to be a Ruthenian who did his full share during the War, sent to Mr. Mackie, M. P., a telegram which was not allowed to be read in the House of Commons, which, though suggested by Mr. D. D. MacKenzie, M. P., Leader of the Opposition, was not given.

Mr. Mackie subsequently gave the telegram to the Canadian press which was given space but no prominence in some of the papers:

"The Ukrainians are the only solid backbone behind Union Government in Canada. Charges against Bishop Budka same as in 1914. Conspiracy to get him out of Canada by a bunch of scoundrels. You know me for years and you may depend on my word. You know what I have accomplished for the British flag amongst Ukrainians in Canada and you may tell the Government that they can

rely upon Ukrainian element notwithstanding what an organized Camarilla may invent. Ukrainians all over Canada, calm and supporting all the measures of Union Government for reconstruction, not Mr. Ross, nor any other prevaricator can shake their confidences in Dominion Government. Tell straight to the House that Ross is lying."

It will take more than a gang of scoundrels with their aiders and abettors to get Bishop Budka out of Canada.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

CATHOLICS who read the daily papers will scarcely have failed to note that in respect to the agreement reached by the British and French Governments concerning the graves of our soldiers in France, the tombstone reproduced in illustration bears the good old Catholic prayer: "Have mercy upon him O Lord, and let perpetual light shine upon him." The inscription at the base of each stone will, it is true, be chosen by the relatives of the dead. It is nevertheless not without significance that the one chosen for illustration is as mentioned. Whatever effect the War may in the long run prove to have had upon religious belief in general it seems unquestioned that a great impetus has been given among non-Catholics to the holy and wholesome practice of prayers for the dead.

THE HIGH cost of butter is not due, authorities state, to any undue amount being placed in cold storage, but simply to the fact that the supply is not equal to the domestic and foreign demand. American dealers are said to be scouring Canada, especially in the West, and buying up all they can lay their hands on. At the same time the Weekly Bulletin of the Dominion Department of Trade and Commerce announces "a great opening for Canadian Butter in Japan," with prices ranging in that country from \$1.10 to \$1.35 per pound. This latter fact will doubtless be of immense interest to the cold-storage fraternity. In view of the high prices prevailing at home however, the much harassed Canadian housekeeper may well be pardoned if her prayers are directed to the narrowing rather than the widening of export facilities.

THE APPEAL of Professor Mavor of Toronto University to prevent the spoliation of the Doukhobors in the North West in respect to their lands should not be lost upon the Government of Canada. As pointed out by Professor Mavor these people came to Canada under express agreement with our Government that they were to be exempt from military service and have freedom to settle in villages and to ply their several occupations in peace. Both of these conditions were accepted by the Minister of the Interior and the first was embodied in an Order-in-Council. Lands were set apart for them, which on arrival they proceeded to occupy, and have since extensively improved. That, whatever their religious peculiarities or racial shortcomings they should now be deprived of their lands as they were expelled from their homelands in 1907 through a conspiracy of local tradesmen, farmers and politicians, Professor Mavor in an open letter to the Acting Premier, Sir Thomas White, rightly characterizes as "monstrous national crime."

THE WHOLE thing resolves itself into an exploitation of the returned soldier in the interest of greedy land speculators. In 1907, says Professor Mavor, the Dominion Government cancelled the grants of land to the Doukhobors and took from them 400,000 acres. With the knowledge of the Government of British Columbia, the Doukhobors then bought large tracts in that Province. Local speculators and politicians are now exploiting the returned soldier to deprive the Doukhobors of these cultivated lands. On the plea that the returned soldier must have land, they have induced the Government to buy out the Doukhobors at forced sale and then to give the returned soldiers grants of their land. The carefully calculated motive behind it all is quite apparent. It is not the welfare of the returned man that is sought so much as the interest of the land speculator. There is surely vacant land enough in Canada to provide for all without so glaring a national breach of faith.

THE SAME element that has been conspiring to pillage the Doukhobors has also cast an envious eye on the

direction of the Ruthenian colonies in Alberta and Saskatchewan. This takes the form of renewed agitation against these people as "enemy aliens." More especially is this directed against their spiritual chief, Bishop Budka. Notwithstanding that on occasion of his arrest and detention in the first year of the War the Bishop was completely exonerated by Crown officials and shown to have maintained throughout an attitude in perfect accordance with his position in this country, parties to whose interest it is to do so keep up the agitation against him and seek by every means in their power to inflame the public mind to his prejudice. Dispatches of this character appearing from time to time in the newspapers should, therefore, be received as without foundation.

A GRIM story is told by an overseas contemporary of an individual who delighted the Germans during their occupation of Belgium by signifying his readiness to accept their offer of employment. It was a rare thing during those days to find men or women so inclined. Germany's method of dealing with the Belgian people is now matter of history. The individual in question was to the truculent yet anxious Hun a real "find." He was taken before the high command, given a sumptuous meal, and then questioned. "You are really willing to work for us?" he was asked. "Yes." "And you want to go to the front?" "No." "You are willing to work eight hours a day?" "I am willing to work as long as possible." At length the astonished officers enquired of this prodigy of zeal what his trade was. "I am a gravedigger," he quietly replied. History does not tell us that he received the Iron Cross.

THE NEW YORK journal of affairs, Life, commenting on a newspaper reference to the naturalist John Burroughs as being on his latest birthday "eighty-two years young," opines that "it was a fine thing to say the first time, good the next ten times, fair the first hundred times, but that it begins to get a little stale." The Toronto Globe puts "psychological moment" and "acid test" in the same category. It may be questioned, however, if there are any phrases extant so overworked as the "social uplift" and "kiddies" of the eleemosynary institutions. They have long since outrun the "dull thud" of the reporter.

THE PRIME MINISTER'S APOLOGIA

THE TIMES ON LLOYD GEORGE'S SPEECH

Mr. Lloyd George essayed yesterday to give the House of Commons some idea of the manner in which he has been directing the work of the British Delegation at the Peace Conference. He succeeded beyond expectation and, probably, far beyond his own intention. One of his fellow-members of the British Delegation said recently that, in the Council of Ten, Mr. Lloyd George had spoken "in his best Parliamentary style." This he has often done—namely when he has rejected the unanimous report of the Conference Commission on the frontiers of Poland, and when he subsequently denounced—before inviting them to luncheon—the distinguished French writers who had ventured to criticize his attitude. Yesterday's performance in the House of Commons was by no means inferior in point of dignity, tact, wisdom, and truthfulness to some of his oratorical exploits in Paris. How greatly they have contributed to hasten the making of that stern and righteous peace for which the Allied peoples yearn, those who heard him yesterday and those who read him today will readily imagine. A distinguished French writer who had ventured to criticize his attitude. Yesterday's performance in the House of Commons was by no means inferior in point of dignity, tact, wisdom, and truthfulness to some of his oratorical exploits in Paris. How greatly they have contributed to hasten the making of that stern and righteous peace for which the Allied peoples yearn, those who heard him yesterday and those who read him today will readily imagine. A distinguished French writer who had ventured to criticize his attitude. Yesterday's performance in the House of Commons was by no means inferior in point of dignity, tact, wisdom, and truthfulness to some of his oratorical exploits in Paris. How greatly they have contributed to hasten the making of that stern and righteous peace for which the Allied peoples yearn, those who heard him yesterday and those who read him today will readily imagine. A distinguished French writer who had ventured to criticize his attitude.

Toward the end of his oratio pro domo sua the British Prime Minister alluded to the thrill of pleasure he

his references to matters that directly concern the making of the peace, and the stability when made.

Of these matters British and Allied policy in regard to Russia stands foremost. Grave and complicated as the issue undoubtedly is, Mr. Lloyd George handled it in thoroughly "Parliamentary" fashion. He insisted upon the truism that "there is no Russia," but showed no appreciation of the truths that there is a Russian people, and that, next to the conclusion of a satisfactory peace, the greatest interest of the Allied and Associated nations and the "acid test" of their fidelity to Wilsonian principle is that the Russian people shall be helped on to its feet. He made great play with the idea of "a conquest of Russia"—as though there had ever been any serious question in any serious quarter of forming a huge Allied army to "conquer Russia." There has been a question, and there is a question, of helping patriotic Russians to help themselves, of not denying them assistance and encouragement, and of not disheartening them or driving them, in despair, into the arms of Germany, by ill digested improvisations like the "Prinkipo" proposal. The best that can be said of this part of the Prime Minister's oration is that it was disingenuous. Nor does his declaration that there has never been any question of recognizing the Bolshevik Government appear to have been made without a mental reservation. It may be literally true that a definite proposal to recognize Lenin and Trotsky has never been formally discussed or put forward in the Council of Four; but he would be a hardy prevaricator who should maintain that the idea of giving some form of recognition to the Bolsheviks as the *de facto* Government of Russia has not been assiduously discussed by the leading delegates in Paris, and has not been strongly advocated by interested parties. If it was abandoned, or shelved, before it could complete the moral discomfiture of the friends of the Allies in Russia and of the small nations "living on the slopes of the Bolshevik volcano," the result was due in part to the resistance of the French Government and in part to the prompt publicity that has aroused the Prime Minister's resentment. The policy of supporting the dwellers on the slopes of the "volcano," which Mr. Lloyd George announced, may do something to check "the flow of the lava," if it is adhered to and vigorously carried out. But it is accompanied by deplorable and short-sighted "Parliamentary" statements to the effect that we would rather see Russia Bolshevik than Britain bankrupt or by belated apologies for the Prinkipo proposal, its value may be counteracted and its success jeopardized.

In no portion of the Prime Minister's apologia did the weakness of his case stand more clearly revealed than in his references to the great complexity of the problems with which the Conference has to deal. There had, he said, nearly been a quarrel between two Allied peoples over "Teschen." "How many members of this House ever heard of Teschen?" he asked. Everybody has heard of it who knows the later history of Maria Theresa, of Frederick II. and of Catherine II.; everybody who knows the origin of Russian influence in Germany, or who knows the beginnings of the French Revolutionary War. Mr. Lloyd George evidently judges the knowledge of members of Parliament by the standard of his own. However much they may appreciate the compliment, they are not the responsible delegates of the British Government at the Peace Conference. If Mr. Lloyd George, of whom it is currently said by his colleagues in Paris that while he is able to read and write he does neither, had studied the excellent memoranda prepared months ago for the enlightenment of Allied Delegates by the Polish and Czech-Slovak experts, he would have known that the great mineral wealth of Teschen makes the question, in its way, as important as that of the Basin of the Sarre. Had he further consulted the columns of The Times in years gone by, he might have learned of the great properties formerly possessed at Teschen by the Archduke Frederick, the wealthiest of Austro-Hungarian Archdukes, and of their sale to a great armaments firm. But he apparently cares for none of these things. Strong in his ignorance of other aspects of the Polish question, that are, at least, indirectly connected with the Teschen issue, he made bold to reject the unanimous report of the Conference experts on Poland and went far by his attitude to weaken the spirit of the Polish people in their struggle against Bolshevism. Now he has learned from M. Paderewski that the Poles are anti-Bolshevik. Did he not know it before his treatment of the Danzig question rendered M. Paderewski's gallant fight against Bolshevism almost hopeless? The truth is that Parliamentary politicians like Mr. Lloyd George ought not to have wasted weeks at the beginning of the Conference by setting themselves down at the Quai d'Orsay as a sort of elementary school addressing the primary instruction in European politics and geography, instead of appointing from the outset expert commissions to solve political and geographical problems in the light of the general principles governing the Peace which the Conference leaders alone were competent to lay down.

Toward the end of his oratio pro domo sua the British Prime Minister alluded to the thrill of pleasure he had felt when the English way of doing things was praised at a recent session of the Conference. What sort of thrill will his Colleagues in Paris feel when they read his performance of yesterday, with its half truths and palliations, its *suppression veri* and *suggestio falsi*, its false analogies and cheap rhetorical effects? They will note, without amusement, his evident care for his political position and his obvious desire not to give the House of Commons any trustworthy material upon which to judge him before the terms of Peace have been communicated to the enemy. They will note the entire absence of any determination on his part to deal promptly and vigorously with the enemy, in case the peace terms be rejected. They will also note his philippic against this journal. On this head we are not concerned to answer him, beyond stating that at no point of his speech were his statements less accurate and less worthy. Our readers, who know the traditions of The Times, will not expect us to compete with the Prime Minister in "Parliamentary style." The record of this journal during the crisis that preceded the War will bear closer examination than that of Mr. Lloyd George. His record during the War is known of all who read and of many who do not read it. Some points of his war record may require to be more fully known when a public service can be rendered by making them known, and by showing that, if the Allied peoples are now within sight of a tolerable peace it is in part at least, because Mr. Lloyd George has had at some critical moments a "bad press." That time is not yet. Meanwhile The Times will continue undeviatingly to pursue its course, looking neither to the right or to the left, striving to correct popular misapprehensions and Ministerial ignorance, respecting no persons, being subservient to none, and maintaining by honest and fearless publicity what it conceives to be the highest traditions of British journalism.—The London Times, April 17th.

CATHOLICS' PROGRAM FOR LABOR UNREST

RELIEF OF INDUSTRIAL ILLS THE OBJECT OF PROPOSALS OF COUNCIL OF FOUR BISHOPS

The National Catholic War Council, represented by the Bishops of Rockford, Toledo, Tagaste, and Charleston, has issued a plan of social re-construction which is unique in its support of the highly progressive attitude taken toward the solution of present day industrial problems. Among the defects of the industrial system of to-day it mentions "the enormous inefficiency and waste in the production and distribution of commodities; insufficient income for the great majority of wage earners, and unnecessarily large incomes for a small minority of privileged capitalists."

Prefacing its program by a survey of the industrial platforms of the British Labor Party, the labor plan of Quaker employers in Great Britain, and the programs of the American labor organizations, such as the California State Federation of Labor, the State Federation of Labor of Ohio, and the Chicago Federation of Labor, the Catholic Council takes up the situation in our country and suggests a definite outline of reconstruction.

Coming down to actual principles of labor conditions under which the American employee should be allowed to work, the first suggestion made is the continued maintenance of the National War Labor Board. Its work during war-times is succinctly summed up as follows:

"Upon the basis of a few fundamental principles, unanimously adopted by the representation of labor, capital, and the public, it has prevented innumerable strikes, and raised wages to decent levels in many different industries throughout the country. Its main guiding principles have been a family wage for all male adult laborers; recognition of the right of labor to organize and to deal with employers through its chosen representatives; and no coercion of non-union laborers by members of the union. The principles, methods, machinery, and results of this institution constitute a definite and far-reaching gain for social justice."

WOULD MAINTAIN HIGH WAGES

The question of wages is next considered. The phases taken up under this heading are the keeping up of the present wage rate and the establishment of a legal minimum wage. The organization takes the position that even though a large majority of workers are in receipt of more than living wages, they are entitled to them. On this point the Bishops say:

"In a few industries, especially some directly and peculiarly connected with the carrying on of the war, wages have reached a plane upon which they cannot possibly continue for this grade of occupations. But the number of workers in this situation is an extremely small proportion of the entire wage-earning population. The overwhelming majority should not be compelled or suffered to undergo any reduction in their rates of remuneration, for two reasons: First, because the average rate of pay has not increased faster than the cost of living; second, because a considerable majority of wage earners of the United States, both men and women, were not receiving living wages when prices be-