

tion and to the good old Seceders. At length the father died, and the congregation met to consider what stipend they should give the son, now that he was sole pastor of the congregation; and the question was not whether they would give him £180, which they ought to have done, seeing that the giving of £180 before proved that they were able to do it; the question was, whether they would give the son the £100 the father had, or keep him at the £80. Well the question was put, whereupon an honest weaver stood up, and was clear for keeping the incumbent at £80. He said that he did not see any reason for ministers having more for weaving sermons than he had for weaving webs. He was for holding them down to the lowest figure, in proof of which, he said, the fact was that the Church never had such ministers as in those days when they went about in sheepskins and goatskins, and lived in caves and holes of the earth. If any people sympathise with the weaver, I answer that I have a radical objection to caves—they create damp—and, secondly, as to the habiliments, it will be time enough to take up that question when our people are prepared to walk along Prince's Street with us—with me, not in this antique dress, but in the more primitive and antiquated fashion of goatskins with the horns on. It is very easy to dispose of this evasion. I shall pass on to the second evasion, and it was from a case too. It was not in my own congregation—let me say that it was not in any congregation of the Free Church. It is contained in a remark I shall repeat. There was the same evasion in it, but it looks very pious, and it is all the worse for that. It was contained in a remark made by a lady to the wife of a poor minister of a wealthy congregation, who, by keeping boarders, had to eke out a living that some of the merchant princes in his congregation could have paid out of their own pocket, and never missed it. The lady, rustling in silks, and in a blaze of jewels, went to visit the minister's wife, more a lady than herself, with the exception of the dress. The lady condoled with the minister's wife on the straitened circumstances and means of the ministers, and she condoled thus:—'Ah! says she, 'my dear,' looking into the pale, careworn face of the excellent woman, 'My dear,' she said, 'your reward is above.' From the bloodless lips of some poor sinner in an unfurnished garret, where the man of God has gone to smoothe the dying pillow and to minister consolation in that last dark hour, I have been thankful to hear those words, 'Your reward is above;' but from silks and satins, disgusting!—it is cant, the vilest cant, and enough to make religion stink in the nostrils of the world. Would that saying pay the minister's stipend—pay the minister's accounts? Fancy the worthy man going to his baker or his butcher, and instead of paying down money, turning up the white of his eyes, saying, 'Your reward is above.' I fancy they would say, 'Oh! no, my good Sir, that will not pay the bill;' and I say what does not pay the bill, does not pay the ministers' stipends as they ought to be paid. There is another answer, another way of getting rid of this question, that I want the Christian public to look at. I have heard it myself; it is a very common answer, and it is this, that ministers should not be rich. Now, I am not wanting ministers to be rich; I do not want to be rich myself; although it is a sweet thing to be able to pour a blessing into an empty cup. I want to know why I should be deprived of that pleasure any more than other people? I want to know if I have not a heart as well as other men? Have not I pity as well as other men? Have not I delight in seeing and hearing the widow's blessing as well as other men? I want to know more than that; I demand to know the reason why riches are more dangerous to ministers than they are to other people? I want to know why men can stand up before the public and say that ministers would make a worse use of their money than other people? Are those who have received a liberal education, cultivated minds, holding a sacred office, occupying a public position, whose piety should be fired at the altars where they minister, and whose sympathies are daily moved by the misery and poverty they see—are they less likely to make a good use of money than other men? Does any man in this house say that Agur's