

the "curse" is left to work itself out amongst the poor? These are questions which will want a good deal of answering. The government which came in on the cry of dealing with social reform is willing to take up "the white man's burden" in any part of the world except England. English people who have not water enough to drink or sufficient houseroom in which to live with common decency are referred to the royal commissions.

Mr. Asquith gave the opposition a strong lead in a speech which did not mince matters. He pointed out that under our existing system of tenure and rating, vacant land is being held up round our big towns, without contributing a penny to the rates. The owner is simply speculating for a rise, precisely as the man speculates who makes a corner in wheat. If he happens to own houses in the town so much the better for him. The more closely he can beleaguer it the higher his rents will rise, and if overcrowding follows, so much the better for him again, for the greater the crowd the greater the rent. This process is being exploited for all it is worth, and there is nothing for it up to the present but to submit. Sir J. Brunner mentioned the case of West Ham, which is a flagrant instance of this monopoly pressure. It seems that the rates in this part of outer London would be reduced by 1s. 6d. in the pound if vacant sites were brought into the account. But that is not all. The rents in West Ham, which are being screwed higher and higher, would go down as the vacant land was taxed into occupation, and the pressure of rent and crowding throughout London would be relieved. The housing question, as Mr. Asquith indicated, will clearly have to be attacked from this quarter. It is imperative, too, as Mr. Asquith said, that municipalities should have the power of compulsorily acquiring land on reasonable terms to be let for building purposes.

Mr. Balfour naturally chafes at proposals that appear to be aimed at his own class. The doctrine that the people exist for the town owners, and not the towns for the people, is a menace to the first conditions of civilized society. The rate-payers' power of paying for improvements by setting the housing acts in motion, and of buying out landlords at a fictitious valuation is not inexhaustible. Why not convoke a national meeting of representatives of municipalities and urban boards to call for the rating of ground values?—London Chronicle of Feb. 11.

THE CHURCHES ARE LOOKING OUT FOR THE BRICKS.

The theory of the church to-day is that it must devote the whole of its attention to men simply as individuals; that if we can succeed in bringing to bear on each individual such influences as will lead him to consecrate himself in loyal fealty to his highest ideals of duty, then every one in society being right the whole of society must necessarily be right. This is exclusively individualistic. This statement looks so true that most people at once accept it as a self-evident truth. Everyone being right, must not the whole be right? . . .

Does the goodness of every brick insure the goodness of the building? Do arrangement, adjustment and architecture count for nothing? Does the goodness of every soldier insure the goodness of the whole army? Do organization, adaptation of parts and strategy count for nothing? Is an army merely an unorganized assemblage of soldiers, a mere mob? Does the goodness of the type insure the intelligence and goodness of the book? Do arrangement and relationship count for nothing?

As a building is not a mere pile of bricks, as an army is not a mere collection of men, as a book is not a mere mass of type, so society is not a mere assemblage of individuals. Society is an organization, a relationship of part to part, an adaptation, an adjustment, just as a building, an army, a machine or a book. "No man liveth unto himself; we are members one of another."

The church founds its faith exclusively on the goodness of the individual parts, and gives no heed to the relationship of the parts—a fatal mistake. For, just as bad architecture will ruin any building, no matter how good the parts; just as bad adjustments will insure the defeat of any army, no matter how good the soldiers; just as bad adjustment will wreck any machine, so will bad relationship or bad adjustment vitiate humanity in spite of all we may do for the goodness of individuals.

We are placed in charge of the architecture of humanity, in comparison with which the grandest architecture of earth's proudest temple shrinks into insignificance; we are placed in charge of a campaign for the overthrow of all that is wrong and for the triumph of all that is lovely in goodness and beautiful in holiness; and how are we fulfilling these duties? According to a theory, which, if applied to architecture, or to generalship, would be the sheerest madness.

To-day the church expects the employer to pay the stipulated wages honestly according to the standard of the market, but it makes no effort to find out why the market is such that men and women are compelled to work like beasts for the living of a dog. Respecting the land, the Bible says: "Take it and till it, that ye may enjoy the fruits thereof." But our churches to-day utter no protest or condemnation of the use of the land for the robbery of industry by speculation. Christianity came to draw men together into the bonds of a brotherhood, but the church gives no heed to the fact that our cities are now huge forces that destroy brotherhood—that sever men into hostile ranks, master and servant, lord and serf, palace and hovel—and the greater the city, the wider this severance, the more pronounced the injustice. Industry, by every possible means, strives to bless the world with abundance; but it is doomed by our social maladjustment to suffer scarcity, while the claimant of an area in a large city, on which he need not raise a pound of goods in a century, procures wealth and affluence far beyond the point of satiety. As to the eternal injustice, the church is not merely silent, but it actually condones and gives its moral support to this perennial crime by surrounding the wealthy recipient with every mark of consideration and seeking a share in his spoils for its ecclesiastical institutions.—W. A. Douglass, in *Citizen and Country*, of Toronto.

ADDRESS TO THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES.

March 13, 1899.

The full ratification of the treaty with Spain will cause a technical change in the relations of the United States to the Philippine islands, but will afford no reason for any change in the views of the anti-imperialists in regard to the future of the islands, nor will it in the least affect the clear duty of this republic.

We are now engaged in warfare with the inhabitants of those islands. It is unprofitable to discuss the question as to which party began hostilities. No other result could have been expected, when the lines of two opposing military forces were held so close and in such tense condition that little was needed to cause an explosion.

The evidence is very clear that Aguinaldo was brought to the islands by our own warship; that his aid was accepted and desired in our military operations against the Spaniards; that hopes of independence were encouraged by our consuls and other officers;