

2. Donations should increase with the increase of ability to give. "As God hath prospered him." This requires the rich to give proportionally to their increasing wealth, though, in order to do it, they must give thousands of dollars where they used to give one. And these great donations are not to be regarded as specially praiseworthy, more than smaller gifts which cost as great sacrifices and are proportionally as much. In both cases the giver has but "done what it was his duty to do."

3. The rich must give a larger proportion of their income than the poor. A poor widow with a helpless family cannot give a tenth of her earnings without taking bread from her children. Will any imagine that a man who has wealth, or even a competency, is required to give no larger a proportion of his income than that widow? A poor labourer may be subjected to more inconvenience by giving five dollars, than a man of wealth by giving five thousand. Hence, the greater a man's wealth, the larger must be the proportion of income which he gives. Hence the propriety of a rule adopted by Mr. N.R. Cobb, a merchant of Boston, to give from the outset *one-quarter* of the net profits of his business; should he ever be worth \$20,000, to give *one-half* of the net profits; if worth \$30,000, to give *three-quarters*; and if ever worth \$50,000, to give *all* the profits. This resolution he kept till his death, at the age of 36, when he had already acquired \$50,000, and was giving all his profits.

Different individuals, who had aimed at systematic benevolence, have come to different conclusions as to the proportion which they ought to give; and, perhaps, each one to a correct conclusion, in his particular circumstances. Zaccheus gave *half* of his goods to the poor, besides restoring fourfold his unjust gains. The first converts at Jerusalem, to meet their peculiar circumstances, sold their possessions and made distribution of the avails, as every man had need. Paul repeatedly intimates that he had suffered the loss of all things. Others have adopted plans similar, in the main, to that of Mr. Cobb, already cited. Others, after paying what has been needful for a most economical support, have given all their income. John Wesley is an example. "When his income was £30 a year, he lived on £28, and gave away £2; the next year his income was £60 and still living on £28, he had £32 to give. The fourth year raised his income to £120, and, steadfast to his plan, the poor got £92." Others, again, have given a tenth of the gross amount of their receipts.

Such is the scheme of Christian beneficence devised in heaven, and enjoined by inspired wisdom. Let every man consider that in neglecting it, he sets at nought the authority and the wisdom of God. Men may deride it; and so it is written of one of our Lord's many discourses on the right use of property, "The Pharisees, who were covetous, heard these things, and they derided him."—*Samuel Harris.*

---

## THE CLAIMS OF TEMPERANCE UPON CHRISTIANS.

The letter of VERITAS in last month's INDEPENDENT raises some very important questions which are pressing themselves with ever increasing force upon the attention of the Christian public, evoking more earnest thought and prayer than at any former period, and demanding for their solution an enlightened unity of feeling and purpose among those who love our Lord Jesus Christ.

How, it may be asked, is such unity to be brought about? We answer, by the employment of the same means in the church which are owned of God for the conversion of sinners. Men are in error and darkness as to the nature of alcohol, and they need to be enlightened and converted. "To the law and to the testimony." We would not go one step beyond the warrant of Scripture. If the general tenor, the plain intent and meaning of God's Word leaves his saved ones at liberty to indulge in the use of intoxicating liquors, aye or no, just as their fancy or appetite may incline them, then we forbear further urging, for we would not be found