

faithful stewards of God's property. Let ministers shew the people from the word of God, that they that preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel, and that it is their duty and their privilege to give to the cause of God, and then there will be no occasion for letting the church know the expence of their Buffalo Skins &c.

Your 'Lady' correspondent is provoked with congregations who give to other objects before their minister is paid: and no doubt it is provoking! but does my dear Lady and many that think like her know? that those who give to other objects in these congregations, generally give more than enough to support their minister at home? If her Ladyship was in connection with a congregation of over a hundred subscribing members, and not being possessed of as much property as the majority of those hundred, and paid fully a twentieth part of the promised stipend, and still that the amount collected was a quarter short, would she consider it her duty to give more? As long as those who subscribe for the support of the minister and do not pay, are receiving church privileges from their respective Sessions; so long are the paying members of the congregation justified in sending the remaining part of their dedicated fund to other objects. Your correspondent considers that it would be neither just nor generous to give more than an unlikely proportion, which he already gives for the support of his own minister till subscribing never paying members of the congregation be considered either paupers or heathen, he will then be willing to give more to support a missionary among them.

I am safe in saying, that many of our congregations do not understand the nature of what is required of them; many support the man, and not the cause: that they rob God by withholding from him his silver and his gold, never enters their thoughts.

Instead of those Buffalo letters, then, let those whose business it is, to teach the people from the word of God, make known to them more plainly, their duty with regard to giving, toward the support of the gospel.

CALVIN.

February 10th 1857.

REMARKS BY OUR CORRESPONDENT.

The writer of the above professes to

concur with the object of my communication, and only to disapprove of the mode in which it is advocated. He would have ministers enforce upon their hearers, from the word of God, the general duty of supporting the ordinances of religion. To this I answer, all this has been done, again and again, from the pulpit and the press. And the general duty is universally acknowledged. How, then, does it happen that it is so imperfectly discharged? The reason evidently is, that the greater part of our people are not aware of what is necessary at the present time for the maintenance of a family. There are few who have made calculations on the subject, and men well disposed, and otherwise intelligent, are quite ignorant on the subject. Hence the necessity of laying before them facts, and as long as there are persons in our Church who think that a minister can support a family *in the way that they expect him to do* on £100, so long it will be necessary to inform them more correctly. I have found that the most effectual mode of arguing with such was to ask them to calculate what it would require to support their own families. Such have been astonished to find that, while they had been expecting their minister to support his family on £100 or £120, they could not support theirs on £150. Now, it was from no desire to employ "grovelling considerations," as your correspondent affirms, but merely to afford information which is greatly needed, that I wrote as I did.

While your correspondent professes to concur in the object aimed at, the spirit of a portion of what he has written tends to defeat it, particularly when he sneers at some of our ministers as "effeminate young men," and attaching too much importance to such "luxuries" as a horse and waggon. These sneers are entirely gratuitous. Our young men have never given any indications of effeminacy, and they have never sought for "luxuries." I assumed that in scattered country congregations a horse and waggon are *necessary* to the *efficient* discharge of their duties. No minister has ever sought them as a luxury to enjoy himself with, as your correspondent insinuates, and as so many of our people employ them.— They only keep them because they have to. Many of them would gladly dispense with them if they thought they could do their duty to their flocks with—