

"things new and old," but to be their echo, a reflector of their *already formed opinions* and ideas (and probably, when occasion may require it, to lend a helping hand in political struggles). This, then, is another source of discouragement to the minister, and leads him to think of congregations more "reasonable," where his labours might be appreciated and his task more pleasant; and "who is to blame" if he does wish to better this state of matters by a change?

But there is yet another point to which we would allude as a disturbing cause, and on which there has been much plain speaking already, without much apparent good resulting, viz.: that there is a "generation" in every congregation always whining to the tune of "Poverty," who receive the spiritual services of their minister without a proper temporal acknowledgment. No true minister will ever preach with an eye to worldly results. He will never forget that his main purpose is to win *souls*, not to *acquire wealth*. But how much do the conduct of some show that they forget that their minister, in common with all men, has his physical and domestic wants. He needs his food and raiment as well as other men; a home he must have as well as they; and, according to the present arrangements of society, these can only be procured and supplied by money. Where is it to come from? As a general rule, it comes as the reward of labour. Does he not labour? What work is or can be more arduous than his? His is the exhausting labour of the brain and heart, that draws more freely and constantly upon the fountains of life and energy than any other. What work is more useful to society than his? And if it be the most useful, and at the same time the most uphill, it surely ought to meet with an ample secular return. "If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great matter if we reap your carnal things?" "Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live by the gospel." Yet there are many who receive and expect large services, and make little or no return. There are families in congregations who spend more, per annum, for *tobacco* (not to speak of liquor) than to support the man who is giving the best energies of his cultivated mind, "spending and being spent" to save their souls. For a paltry subscription paid, probably by instalments of quarter dollars, some expect twelve months' preaching and great pastoral attention, by frequent visits. What is more unreasonable still, he regards the trifle he has subscribed rather as a *charity* than a *debt*. Charity, forsooth! Cail that charity, if you will, which you give for the food that perishes, and for the pleasures that are at best but poison; but, in the name of justice and reason, call not that *charity* which you tender to the man to whom you own your best ideas, your holiest impressions! It is *he*, with his sweating brain and ever anxious

heart, and *not you*, that shows charity. How can a minister discharge the duties of his office, if his mind be not kept from gnawing cares, and secular anxieties, by providing for himself and family the necessaries of life?

Are not these then some reasons that may justify a minister in turning his back upon his native land, to seek in another country what his own denies him by underrating his services? or if not leaving his native land under these circumstances, is he not justified in "changing his spots" in the field where he labours and leave congregations, who are *able* but *not willing* to pay him, in "spiritual destitution" until they learn to appreciate the opportunities they have thrown away. Were his position less precarious, as it is in the case of the parochial clergy in Scotland, then were he in a position to grapple with these difficulties we have mentioned; but when arrears on the part of congregations discover faults in their minister that before did not exist, then *dissatisfaction* and *non payment* ensue, and the minister to avoid becoming bankrupt, and steeped in poverty is forced to make a change. "Large congregations have for years been without pastors" and tho' not idle have not been doing a *tithe* of what they might; some have built Churches others have not! might they not in addition to this have been accumulating a fund that would supplement the ill paid salaries of pastors when they did get them? "Congregations" should strive more to remove the causes of their pastor leaving them before they so strongly characterize their leaving them in such strong language.

Far be it from us to bring these charges against any congregation indiscriminately, for we well know that there are in every congregation those who admit and deplore the unenviable circumstances of the colonial clergy as much as we do. Men who *do* much, and *sacrifice* much to ameliorate matters, but being left alone to "bear the burden" of it a heavy one, it must fall to the ground. We know congregations where the work is done by a few of its members, they are never in arrears in their part, they never fault their ministers, they are never officiously dictating what he should do and how he should do it. but by their earnest hearty co-operations lighten his duties and make his task pleasant. But it is unreasonable to expect that a *few* can continue to attend to their own, and the duties of others; and it is equally unreasonable to stigmatize a minister as a "traitor" because the force of circumstances has driven him from his native Province, or to say that he preaches for "filthy lucre's" sake if he simply ask for his own well earned stipend to procure with it the necessaries of life. Who then is to blame?

C. C.