

soul. But when we speak of these things, some who profess to be exceedingly spiritual point to *the apostle Paul*, and tell us that he did not live of the Gospel, but, instead, laboured with his own hand to support himself and friends. True, we reply. This is just the exception that proves the rule. Paul states very emphatically that he had a right to stop working with his hands, to marry a wife, and to become chargeable on the Church. He had the right, but he would not use it. It was to the praise of Paul that he would take no support from the Corinthian church; but it was to the perpetual blame of these Corinthians that they were not permitted to help him. And this reminds us of the fact that sometimes

THE BEST MINISTERS ARE THE WORST PAID.

Matthew Henry, in his pithy way, says that "a scandalous maintenance makes a scandalous ministry." Thank God, not always. No minister of the Gospel ever received less than the apostle Paul, and who ever preached better? The fact that a man receives a big salary is no proof that he is a faithful minister of Christ. Perhaps it only proves that he is a trimmer and a time-server, able to get the soft side of the rich and keep wealthy sinners at ease by prophesying smooth things, and crying "Peace, peace," when there is no peace.

The fact, also, that a man receives a mere pittance is no proof that he is an unfaithful or inefficient minister of the Gospel. It may only be the proof that he is bold as a lion, and, whether men hear or forbear, declares the whole counsel of God. But, to return to Paul, if he refused to take a cent from these rich Corinthian curmudgeons, he takes care to say to them; "I robbed other Churches,* taking

* Yet these other churches did not grumble that the burden of the apostle's support should fall partly on them, while the rich Corinthians, who were well able to pay Paul, gave him nothing. Such reasoning, though seemingly wise, is entirely sophistical and contrary to the spirit of that gospel which says, "It is more blessed to give than to receive." The only plausible argument against this scheme which I have heard is just this—I shall try to put it in the very words addressed to me by a city gentleman. He said: "I know the farmers in such and such a district. They are rich men. Most of them have large farms of their own and money in the bank. They are far better off than I am, and