

tion the qualities necessary to insure success in that direction they fail. Or perhaps they inherit from their parents physical weakness of constitution, are literally "born tired," and really unable to "hoe their row" in the world's great field of labor. Who has not known many honest persons who were suffering from one or both of the above named disabilities? Surely poverty is not a fault with such. But perhaps Dr. Wild referred more especially to anarchists, socialists and others of their kind, who, if I understand them, are not *willing* to labor, but would like to compel their wealthy neighbors to divide their property among them; if so, I think perhaps his judgment may be just, but he ought in fairness to have said so; for as his opinion now stands on record it is, in effect, briefly this: All poverty is the direct result of vice or the vicious tendency of the poor; whereas I think it *might* be proved that, in many cases, vice is largely the result of poverty. At any rate there should be a distinction made between the virtuous and the vicious poor.

As to the possibility of the evil of poverty being cured or "rectified by the operations of legislation." I think "Uncle Sam" *could* so legislate as to "give us all a farm." but the wisdom of such a course might, perhaps, properly be questioned. For it seems true that the lack of power to gain is often accompanied by an equal lack of power to retain property if bestowed. But is *poverty* always an evil? Verily I think not, but on the contrary it is many times the instrument of God to draw souls nearer to Him, and thus in reality a blessing. Indeed it seems true to me that as a rule, the tendency of wealth is to make its possessors worldly and self-satisfied; they glory in their superior business ability using it too often alas! to overreach their less unfortunate brethren, seemingly forgetful that they are indebted to a Higher Power for all *their* boasted powers, and that to Him alone is all the glory due.

"How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God!" And again, "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter in the kingdom of God." Mark, 10th chap., 23th and 25th verses. So said our Saviour, the meek and lowly Nazarene, who had "not where to lay his head," but whose word no Christian will dispute. Yet there seems to be many noble exceptions to the above rule, and Jesus himself admits that they are possible." (Mark x., 27). So let not the owners of wealth consider it of necessity a barrier to spiritual attainments, but let them consecrate themselves and their possessions wholly and without reserve to the Lord's service and all will be well.

And to the poor who feel that their lot is a hard and evil one, I would say, that the best cure I *know* of is to cease rebelling against the inevitable; in other words to accept their position in life, if it seems unavoidable, as the will of God concerning them and be resigned thereto. Try this, O ye discontented and murmuring ones, and see how wonderfully it will sweeten your lives. Seek earnestly to "lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven," and you will not so keenly feel the absence of earthly treasures. And may God grant you power so to do. Amen.

HENRY A. COLEMAN.

Irondequoit, 10th mo., 1887.

The following is sent by Professor Magill of Swarthmore College, in response to an invitation to forward his view on the "Temperance Question" for publication in the REVIEW. The letter, which we have permission to publish also, may be interesting to our readers as a bit of history in slavery times. It is in answer to a question we asked the Professor as to whether Wm. Lloyd Garrison was a Third-party man in the "Slavery Question," which the Third-party men in the Temperance Question wish us to believe, or whether he was not. Both the Prohibitionists