

the dishonesty. "If people have anything to give, why can not they do it in a more delicate way?" "And why not pay a minister such a salary as shall make him above the necessity of presents?" It is hard to make a large and wealthy church perceive why, from their point of view. But small churches, where there are not more than a dozen male heads of families and no wealthy members, comprehend the reason *why*, with a very defined clearness. The donation visit will be good or bad, as you view it.

There is another kind of visit that will be very much modified by the aspect in which it is viewed. We refer to the *visits from the pastor to his people*, both in respect to their frequency and their kind. These visits, as viewed by some, are the *sine quâ non* of pastoral efficiency. How can a pastor know his people that does not often visit them? How can he know their experiences, and fit his discourses to meet them, if he do not frequently converse with them, and learn their sorrows, joys, hopes and fears? Visiting makes his own heart better, draws out the affections of a people towards him, awakens an earnest desire for the conversion of the younger members of the family and those who are Christless, brings him into contact with humanity under different phases, and thus teaches him what he never could learn from books, and is every way as good for the minister as the people.

If the minister has no taste for the work, he takes another view of it; he regards it as wasted time. Visiting the sick he thinks well enough, but to visit people in health and spend time in gossip is a shame for a minister, who should spend his time in reading and preparing for the pulpit. Much may be said on both sides—as you view it. The truth however is *somewhere*, and is doubtless more favourable to visiting than to its neglect.

So, as to the *manner* of a visit. "Familiarity breeds contempt," is a well known proverb, and in horror of this contempt, some ministers utterly eschew all intimacy with their people. They never for a moment throw off the ecclesiastic, or encourage them to speak out freely. The mysterious sanctity with which they are invested, forbids all freedom, which they fear may destroy their usefulness. There is another view of this which others take. Real dignity is not so easily upset, nor so afraid of being compromised; it knows how to stoop, as well as how to stand erect; it can be free and easy in the consciousness that the respect conceded to it, was not won, nor will be kept by assumptions, but is based on something better. There is a happy medium between a low familiarity, and a stiff forbidding demeanour that debars excess and discourages confidence. Ministers, then, will be regulated by the moral aspect which the matter assumes to their minds.

Aspects vary opinions in regard to *amusements*, and other things of which we cannot now speak. Some striking arguments have been published in favour of many amusements usually considered exceptionable, all resulting from setting them in another light.

Now one thing is certain, that the lights and shades in which a question is set cannot alter its moral qualities. They cannot make right to be wrong, or change bad into good. A specious argument for, or against anything may be the result of the aspect in which it is seen: but the moral quality of the thing is certainly not determined by it.

Hence, if we would be wise and good, and judge righteous judgment, we should not take a one-sided view of anything. Those who only see things on one side and in one light are generally the most set in their own opinions, and yet there is only one chance out of many that they are right. Let us not