

people who are ailing. They might not be deserving people, and unscientific giving is the curse of true charity. Give your money to us so our trained investigators can expend it scientifically."

And yet, this organization which demands this monopoly of charity is appealing to the people of Chicago for \$125,000, which it says must be raised in ten days!

In that appeal lies a confession of failure. And if the United Charities are so signally failing in their attempt to monopolize the needs of the suffering poor of Chicago on which they depend for their capital, why does not the organization turn over the cases of some of the widowed mothers it claims to be supporting, to the state?

What was the Mothers' Pension law passed for, with its broad, humanitarian provisions designed to care for the future citizens of the state?

Why does not the United Charities call upon the state to carry out the implied promise made by the state to suffering mothers in that act?

Why does the United Charities fight the turning over of these cases to the state, saying that they themselves are better able to handle them in their "scientific" manner?

If the United Charities fell \$125,000 short of what it needed for this winter it is not better able to handle these cases—it isn't able to handle them at all.

And in the name of the Lowly Carpenter, can't we have a little less of this talk of "science" in the work of the United Charities; this talk of relieving the hunger of the "deserving" only?

Who are the "deserving" anyway? Is a woman, who, by some fortune in the circumstances of her bringing up, has a better constitution than another so that she is able to stand starvation better, both physically and mentally, more deserving than a woman whom a brutal, "scientific" world has so crushed and broken on its "scientific" wheel that she is scarcely in her right mind?

Is the epileptic, the production of a society which allows men and women to be cooped up in reeking holes of tenements in which good farmers would not house their pigs, less deserving than a man or woman in better physical condition?

If Christ were in Chicago today would He stop to ask if that shivering epileptic crying aloud for bread and clothes were worth helping?

Would He stop to ask a starving mother if her husband were a good man, and would He deny her plea if He found out the woman were married to some hulking, drunken brute of a man?

Would He turn away from children because society had allowed them to be born and brought up in the cesspool of a modern city?

Would He draw away from a broken, diseased, helpless woman because society had forced her to break the moral law?

Or would He throw wide His arms, and say as He said once long ago: "Come unto Me all ye weary and I will give you rest?"

Ah, let the United Charities stop talking of "science" and "scientific" treatment, and the necessity for finding out whether a "case" is "deserving" before relieving suffering!

Or, if the United Charities cannot do that, then let them drop the name of charity, the name that once was a synonym for love, but has become the bitterest word in the English language to the poor and the down-trodden, the ones who have been crushed into the very valley of humiliation and despair and soul-sickness by those from whom the United Charities gets its money!