

edents of legal or medical practice. Principle and practice must go hand in hand to ensure thoroughness and efficiency in any walk of life. Practice without doctrine is a will-of-the-wisp. Doctrine without practice is a fruitless tree. The only sure foundation on which faithful practice of Christian duty can be built is sound doctrine, and sound doctrine does not, as many people nowadays seem to think, come to them unsought and untaught.

\*\*\*

#### HOMES FOR WORKERS.

The development and increase of manufactures has among other things developed the need of homes for the wage-earners. Labour is too scarce and too well paid to induce speculators to enter this field now, and it does not seem to appeal to the employers; probably because they need all their means to meet the demands of growth and possibly through fears of strikes and enforced drains on capital. In other times and more established industries the large employers have indulged in efforts to create model towns for their workers. Notably Pullman, near Chicago, and Krupp's workman's city in Germany. In England there are several; the ones best known are Port Sunlight and Cadbury's Garden City. Such as these must always be exceptional, because there is no room for the ordinary workers who may be employed, not in one factory, but in a number, ranging from the great monopoly to the small shop with a few hands. In some parts of England the building societies do much to provide homes for workers. These are managed by the men themselves, who contribute weekly, and have drawings for the finished houses. The lucky ones give mortgages for the balance of their purchase money, and through these and the contributions of the other members new homes are built and the enterprise goes on. The large co-operative societies do much home-building. Indeed, they not only build homes, but sanatoria in the country for convalescents and others. In some parts of the States the trust society system is adopted. They say that they provide a savings bank for the young man, help him with house, etc., when married are guardians for his children, and their little fortunes should he die, and help in every relation in life. But there are always speculative builders who defile, if they can, our cities with lanes, and blocks of buildings put up often in the face of by-laws, and when once up, left up. In the youth of our cities many things are done which cannot be undone easily. Slums arise often with two houses on one frontage, one behind the other, thus giving four dwellings, where only two should be. The speculators and the workers are the enemies of sanitary rules, and yet for the men who can withhold sympathy, which of us does not want a home of their own. These remarks are induced by proposals for municipal building. What we have said simply skims the subject, but we have said enough, we think, to show the need of a well-thought-out scheme before a municipality enters the field along with others. The creation of municipal landlords is undesirable, and if it is intended to build and sell the municipality would be a loser every time. There are, we hope, men of all ranks in Canadian society ready to co-operate in any feasible project to house the workers. The energies and the honesty and firmness of municipal authorities can be sufficiently employed in seeing that all dwellings that are erected are sanitary and comply with needed by-laws. There is in all large cities a growing need of regulating the backs as well as the street fronts of our buildings. We have fine wide streets nowadays. Our predecessors had narrow streets and gardens behind. Now behind our palatial streets are slits of space between the back of buildings, vile, dark, filthy often; such closes or lanes should not be tolerated, there ought to be as much space behind as

in front. If it is necessary to have a street sixty feet wide it is equally so to have sixty feet in the rear. Bad enough as this filling up of garden space is in the case of banks and warehouses, how much worse is it for the workers. And the problem of providing tenements must be faced in our large cities and should be faced intelligently. Much is being done in New York and other large cities across the line. Some little time ago there was an exhibit in New York where plans showing healthily built tenements were exhibited. Tenements must be built. It is pitiful to see at dinner time the crowds of all ages which rush a mile or two for a bite at home and rush back to work. Certainly better to have tenements. The provision of dinner down town is of doubtful value. The woman at home must be remembered. Without husband and with no children, untrained as they too often are now to see, to mend or cook, what is she to do all day?

\*\*\*

#### REV. JAMES SIMPSON AND CHURCH UNION.

Among our numerous correspondents on the very "live" and interesting question of Church Union, no one has a clearer view and a closer grip of the subject, in all its bearings, than the Rev. James Simpson of St. Peter's pro-Cathedral, Charlottetown, P.E.I., and the whole Church in Canada stands indebted to him for his forcible and suggestive handling of the matter in some of his recent communications. His proposal of conditional reordination, in his letters in our issue of 15th, strikes us as the most statesmanlike and practical proposal as yet made, in connection with the very vexed and delicate question of "orders." When we consider the tremendous sacrifices that the "quadrilateral" involves; the waiving of all liturgical forms of worship, the acceptance of the Thirty-nine Articles, the Athanasian Creed, and a host of minor doctrines and practices inexpressibly dear to Anglicans, the suggestion of this very moderate concession on the part of our "separated brethren," seems eminently reasonable. Turn about is fair play, says a good old proverb. All the concessions should not be on one side. The Church of England has solemnly put herself on record as being willing to make immense sacrifices in the cause of reunion. What is the other side prepared to surrender. If a compromise is to be effected, it can only be cemented by mutual sacrifices. Otherwise it can never stand. The Church of England is prepared to come not half, but at least two-thirds of the way. It seems only just and right that there should be some corresponding advance from the other camp. Common justice and fair-play demands it. And only one concession is asked for; on the other three points all orthodox Protestants are agreed. It is not as if the Church of England had formulated a whole string of conditions. According to Mr. Simpson's proposed plan this one concession would be robbed of its sting. Men would not be asked to "repudiate" their orders, but to complete them. Our "dissenting" brethren, to use the term purely for convenience sake, do not attach much importance to the mode of ordination. To them, therefore, it is largely a matter of indifference. To us of the Church of England, on the other hand, it is a matter of vital importance. Surely then, under these circumstances, it is not unreasonable to expect from them the sacrifice of what they admit themselves is a non-essential, especially when we are prepared to ignore on our own part a vast body of ordinances and doctrines and usages and practices interwoven with our history and polity, and incorporated in the everyday life and work of the Church. We have much pleasure in commending Mr. Simpson's proposal to the thoughtful and favorable consideration of all interested in the question. For the best it may be well to remind our readers of the

immense preliminary work that would have to be gone through before Church Reunion in Canada, so far as we are concerned, could become practicable. As Mr. Simpson points out the consent of the whole Anglican Communion would have to be obtained. The Church in England, Scotland, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, India, West Indies, and the United States would all have to be consulted, and their unanimous consent obtained. In view of this, and of other facts, any expectations that may have been formed, as to the speedy realization of any scheme of reunion are doomed to disappointment, although of its final accomplishment we are more than sanguine.

\*\*\*

#### MILITARISM AND PEACE.

Some Canadian statesmen and newspapers are very pronounced in their utterances against militarism, meaning thereby increase of military force and devotion to the art of war, and the same parties who denounce all preparations for possible wars are, logically enough, great advocates of peace among nations. That war is horrible, destructive, and unless waged for a righteous cause, unchristian and unholy, most will admit, but even so, war is not without compensations and develops much that is beautiful and heroic in human life and character. In this country also much can be said against withdrawing men from peaceful occupations, and spending money on arms and fortifications when the country is wanting in population, and wants all its means and resources for the purposes of development and settlement. Its truest interests can be best promoted by making the nation rich and populous, and when that is achieved what is needed for the country's defence can claim attention. For the above line of argument much can be said, and would be unanswerable if Canada stood alone, and had no possible enemies, and were in such a position that war could not be forced upon her. But such is not the case, and there are possible war-like contingencies, which if they should arise, Canada would find it, with her vast territory exposed to both land and naval attack, very difficult to meet and repel. Theorize as we may, might, as well, as right has much to say in the settlement of national disputes, and the nation that is unprepared, to back up its claims and defend its rights will in negotiations, as well, as in actual conflict, have to submit to the will of the stronger. To talk of the loveliness of peace will avail little in the face of an aroused and aggressive enemy, who is bent on conquest, or seeks reparation for a fancied slight or grievance. To be prepared for war is the surest guarantee of peace, and it is a vain delusion to suppose that a country as rich, and vast, and as assailable, as Canada, will, or can remain detached from the vortex of the world's affairs, and the possible wars resulting therefrom. Washington and other early American statesmen indulged in a dream of this kind, but such a position has been found untenable, and the United States is seeking to make her navy equal to that of other first-class powers. Alongside of this depreciation of precautionary warlike preparation, and anti-military crusade on the part of some we notice a disposition, whenever Canadian interests are involved, to insist on our most extreme claims being pushed, even to the verge of war, as in the case of the Alaska boundary, and the Newfoundland fishery question. The air is filled with cries that Canada has been sacrificed to international comity, and the Mother Country is blamed for not pursuing a course which would perhaps end in war, when the party most interested has steadily refused to prepare for such a contingency, and would be the greatest sufferer by it. The brunt of war, if war then be on our account, must be borne by Great Britain, hence the reasonableness of the Imperial Government