

ones sit down, and fold their hands to rest, the work will go right on, and be done in a proper manner. In order to have this need satisfied, it rests upon the younger members to so regulate their lives and conduct that their elders will have perfect confidence in them, and faith in their ability founded on positive knowledge. To do what good they can, or whatever task is allotted to them in the best possible manner, and so strengthen their power of doing. Those already at work are doing surprisingly well, but the Society needs more, *many more*.

The Society, and each member of it, needs to know *why* they hold to certain opinions and ways. Young people's minds are full of questionings, but when they know a good reason for a thing, they are ready to do it with promptness and genuine pride. False pride is wrong, but there is a sort of lofty humility that makes us not ashamed to do what we know to be right, but rather to rejoice therein with quiet pleasure. It is this sort of pride that young people need to have in Friends' Society, for the good it has done and still may do. The Society needs the genuine pride of its young people, so that when they write essays for public occasions, or do literary work for their own advancement, they may at the same time advance the cause. I have often thought how entertaining it would be, and productive of good, if the pupils of Friends' Schools and Colleges would establish writing contests, to see who could write the best essays in keeping with Friends' doctrine, and send them to the Friends' papers as the best efforts of their school. It would soon get to be more exhilarating than ball games and boating contests. Try it, Swarthmore, and see if some who do not know will stop saying: "Swarthmore is doing us no good!" I know the Society needs Swarthmore, and may well delight in her achievements, yes, in Swarthmore, and *many more*.

JULIA M. DUTTON.

WHAT IS OUR DUTY?

It was my privilege during the last year to listen twice to a young minister who seemed to preach with a power which could come from the spirit of God alone. It was truly good to listen to him, and I noticed that he had the deep heart-felt sympathy and admiration of his audience. His brother ministers in different denominations look up to him with respect, and the most intellectual part of the community prophesy for him a very brilliant career. As we left the church I remarked to a friend that we had listened to a good Quaker sermon (for such it was), and she answered me: "Yes, whenever a highly talented minister preaches a little in advance of his times and brings up deep spiritual views of the religious life, people listen to him with wonder and admiration, not knowing it is really the Quaker's belief he is teaching." In the sermon referred to the speaker very beautifully brought to view "the voice of God in the soul of man." I have felt that the doctrines of our Society are what a great mass of people are hungering for to-day. I believe that in a different way the Society of Friends is needed now as much as in George Fox's time. Now, if this is true and if we Friends have a good reason for preferring our own Society to any other, why is it so often said, "Friends do no proselyting," both by our own members and others, until I believe that our young people will come to think that it is contrary to our rules to endeavor to increase our numbers, and the query: "How are we to retain our younger members?" will seem to imply that this is the only lawful means of keeping up our meetings. If our teachings are true and our doctrines such as the world needs, then why not take as much time and trouble to present our views to the world in the best possible form, as other religious societies do? If, as S. F. says in the REVIEW for second month: "It is not necessary that the Society of