

subordinate to the good of humanity. But if the individual is not restrained for the good of the community, there is not a corresponding duty to provide the individual with unity to live in. In a hasty and arbitrary conditions, may is it the highest degree essential to the community itself that there shall be a minimum of comfort and respect, below which no family will be allowed to live. If we say, dear good, you shall not live, you shall not also say, "for you shall have a good home to live in." But we do not provide for the unit houses. We do not enforce laws with regard to unit houses. We are content to our duty in both directions. A few days ago while traveling together in a train, an agent of a tenement landlord remarked to me he wished to have certain units torn down that were unfit for occupancy, but had been asked by the city council not to tear them down. He said, in effect, "I know that the law says you are not to tear them down. Yet, if you do tear them down, the occupants will be on the street."

Now shall we remedy this? Shall we better the condition of the people? This is a matter about which to throw out a few suggestions. We have read the proposals with the name of the Honorable J. M. Anderson. That proposal is a good one, but it does not meet the crying need of the hour. It regards the construction of new houses, on long credit and terms, to those who want to be able to contribute such a small amount. It would pay the principal interest in a term of years. These are not to be provided for who are living in unit houses. It is to suggest that if these were built and rented, they would occupy the unit houses, and move into better homes, vacating the purchasers of the new houses. But this is a slow process, a certain one, for the vacancies would be tenanted, per-