INDUSTRIAL ECONOMY.

Professor Mitchell's theory of the solution in men's hearts.

The address by Professor Mitchell of the Adelaide University, on "Christianity and industrial questions," was received with great attention by theuden of the Presbyterian Church at this town, Monday morning, and from first to last it proved a perfect triumph, and was received with applause by the president of the Methodist Church.

It seemed at first peculiar, said Professor Mitchell, that Jesus should have said so little about the business of the world. In saying that the kingdom of God was within men, he meant that the kingdom of God had no thing to do with externalities, but only that a man's heart should be right. This kingdom, he said, depended on the spirit which formed and used them. It was not long before that became apparent in the industrial system of that time. Now, as he had said, early fathers had condemned it, but the slave trade organized in the brother, an equal member in the kingdom of God, and under such conditions it was not likely that it could remain. Thus, although Jesus confessed His teaching to a kingdom within men, He found little profit, and the question was whether the actual workmen found any consolation on the interest paid them by the user. The question was whether the chance in the life of the workmen would show any influence in the age that we live. Under modern conditions, capital was invested in the industries, and the workmen were workers. Under those conditions, the question was, whether the interest paid by the users to the user was not the interest of the workmen. In these recent times that it had seemed even possible that not a miracle, and not the workmen, but the workmen, who were the people of the world, might be set up and maintained. (Applause.)

The question is one of those which was the greatest concern of Christianity. We have in the old division of economics, another division, the production, distribution, and exchange of goods. This is added a new capitalistic division, the consumption of goods. But there is no less character. The goods they produce. This division is the greatest concern of Christianity. Of the latter there were many for whom they had no inherent appetite. While there was a higher life of the spirit to keep pace with the new division, production, and exchange of goods, the opportunity of leisure. Economies condemned it as the extinction of their enthusiasm and the consuming luxury. The fundamental Christian principle was that there should be no division at all, that the end to be served was the benefit of the whole.

Socialism and Individualism.

The severest criticism of the individualism of the individualism of the made its way in a more pleasant and good, to have one's own mind on all matters, and the system of the starvation of the rest of one's life. The question is not to be on the assumption that competition would elevate the workmen, for although these do not simply drive them to the wall. The argument for Socialism proceeds as follows. The idea of a law, by which the competition would elevate the workmen, that if they did not simply drive them to the wall. The argument for Socialism proceeds as follows. The idea of a law, by which the the competition would elevate the workmen, that if they did not simply drive them to the wall. The argument for Socialism proceeds as follows. The idea of a law, by which the competition would elevate the workmen, that if they did not simply drive them to the wall. The argument for Socialism proceeds as follows. The idea of a law, by which the competition would elevate the workmen, that if they did not simply drive them to the wall. The argument for Socialism proceeds as follows. The idea of a law, by which the competition would elevate the workmen, that if they did not simply drive them to the wall. The argument for Socialism proceeds as follows. The idea of a law, by which the competition would elevate the workmen, that if they did not simply drive them to the wall. The argument for Socialism proceeds as follows. The idea of a law, by which the competition would elevate the workmen, that if they did not simply drive them to the wall. The argument for Socialism proceeds as follows. The idea of a law, by which the competition would elevate the workmen, that if they did not simply drive them to the wall. The argument for Socialism proceeds as follows. The idea of a law, by which the competition would elevate the workmen, that if they did not simply drive them to the wall. The argument for Socialism proceeds as follows. The idea of a law, by which the competition would elevate the workmen, that if they did not simply drive them to the wall. The argument for Socialism proceeds as follows. The idea of a law, by which the competition would elevate the workmen, that if they did not simply drive them to the wall. The argument for Socialism proceeds as follows. The idea of a law, by which the competition would elevate the workmen, that if they did not simply drive them to the wall. The argument for Socialism proceeds as follows. The idea of a law, by which the competition would elevate the workmen, that if they did not simply drive them to the wall. The argument for Socialism proceeds as follows. The idea of a law, by which the competition would elevate the workmen, that if they did not simply drive them to the wall. The argument for Socialism proceeds as follows. The idea of a law, by which the competition would elevate the workmen, that if they did not simply drive them to the wall. The argument for Socialism proceeds as follows. The idea of a law, by which the competition would elevate the workmen, that if they did not simply drive them to the wall. The argument for Socialism proceeds as follows. The idea of a law, by which the competition would elevate the workmen, that if they did not simply drive them to the wall. The argument for Socialism proceeds as follows. The idea of a law, by which the competition would elevate the workmen, that if they did not simply drive them to the wall. The argument for Socialism proceeds as follows. The idea of a law, by which the competition would elevate the workmen, that if they did not simply drive them to the wall. The argument for Socialism proceeds as follows. The idea of a law, by which the competition would elevate the workmen, that if they did not simply drive them to the wall. The argument for Socialism proceeds as follows. The idea of a law, by which the competition would elevate the workmen, that if they did not simply drive them to the wall. The argument for Socialism proceeds as follows. The idea of a law, by which the competition would elevate the workmen, that if they did not simply drive them to the wall. The argument for Socialism proceeds as follows. The idea of a law, by which the competition would elevate the workmen, that if they did not simply drive them to the wall. The argument for Socialism proceeds as follows. The idea of a law, by which the competition would elevate the workmen, that if they did not simply drive them to the wall. The argument for Socialism proceeds as follows. The idea of a law, by which the competition would elevate the workmen, that if they did not simply drive them to the wall. The argument for Socialism proceeds as follows. The idea of a law, by which the competition would elevate the workmen, that if they did not simply drive them to the wall. The argument for Socialism proceeds as follows. The idea of a law, by which the competition would elevate the workmen, that if they did not simply drive them to the wall. The argument for Socialism proceeds as follows. The idea of a law, by which the competition would elevate the workmen, that if they did not simply drive them to the wall. The argument for Socialism proceeds as follows. The idea of a law, by which the competition would elevate the workmen, that if they did not simply drive them to the wall. The argument for Socialism proceeds as follows. The idea of a law, by which the competition would elevate the workmen, that if they did not simply drive them to the wall. The argument for Socialism proceeds as follows. The idea of a law, by which the competition would elevate the workmen, that if they did not simply drive them to the wall. The argument for Socialism proceeds as follows. The idea of a law, by which the competition would elevate the workmen, that if they did not simply drive them to the wall. The argument for Socialism proceeds as follows. The idea of a law, by which the competition would elevate the workmen, that if they did not simply drive them to the wall.