

A typical case occurs to me. A congregation composed of many well-to-do, and some of them even opulent members, gave a salary quite beneath their means ; their minister had difficulty in supporting his large family. After years of faithful service he died, and somehow the people discovered that his successor had a small private income, and they at once reduced his salary, not on the plea of inability, but because they thought he did not need so much from them. But they never once dreamt of treating their physician, or lawyer, or tradespeople in that shabby way, but only their minister. One of our largest city congregations gave their pastor only \$1,200, and when a deputation of presbytery remonstrated, the reply of one of the elders was, "It would be of no use giving him more, for if we were to double it he would give it all away." To which it was replied, "Most men, however, like to have the spending of their own money." A minister has been recently called to a prosperous town charge. The salary promised was \$1,000. Some of his brethren thought it too small, but the representatives did not think it best to increase it for two reasons :—(1) They did not want to make his place too soft at once, and (2) they did not want to hurt the feelings of their former pastor by too great an increase. How very considerate some people are !

We once overheard two gentlemen discussing this subject in a railway carriage. One of them said :—"I have a brother, one of the oldest ministers in New England, who has never had more than \$600 a year, though he has labored long and faithfully ; I give a lad of sixteen years of age \$1400 per annum, whose chief duty it is to roll and unroll carpets in the warehouse." The second gentleman replied : "A medical man attended a patient and his fee was more than the whole salary of that patient's minister." "Well," said the first, "this just shows how much more men think of their *bodies* than their *souls*."

A minister in the country has a salary, we shall say, of \$800 or \$900, but the necessities of his field require him to keep a horse, which in addition to his labor, costs him from from \$120 to \$150 per annum, for feed, wear and tear, *i.e.*, the minister is required out of his small income to pay annually toward that congregation's maintenance \$150, while wealthy country farmers give their \$5 or \$10 and expect the minister's wife to take a lead-