

declared that, excluding the pastors of city charges, the average, as nearly as could be ascertained, was under \$500 per annum; that in many instances it was not over \$400; while, in a few cases, it did not reach even that sum.

Now, we are far from desiring to see an overpaid ministry, or one independent, pecuniarily, of the churches to which they minister. That is a danger quite imaginary in this country, at least for some time to come. The students in our college have been, for the most part, the sons of those belonging to the poorer and middle classes; the richer class, and those who "seek great things for themselves," have generally turned their attention to pursuits more congenial to their tastes, and more likely to gratify their ambition. And our churches have been quite as blameless of holding out temptation of that kind, as our students and pastors have been of running after it. So that in every way the danger of that sort of worldliness among our ministry has fairly been reduced to a *minimum*.

But there is a worldliness of which our ministers do stand in danger—not the "other-worldliness" of the *Westminster Review*, but that growing out of the possession of *too little* of this world's goods, and one scarcely less paralyzing to effort than that arising from the enjoyment of *too much*. A large family and a small purse are almost as damaging to the pulpit, as the opposite condition is to the pew.

We are aware that there are some persons who think that a salary of from \$400 to \$500 is, or ought to be, quite sufficient to keep any ordinary family respectably and comfortably. We have occasionally met with such. They are generally of the farming class, who have no *rent* to pay, and whose *bread, meat, fuel and clothing* are almost entirely produced upon their own farms; and their own outlay not being very great, they conclude that such a salary as that named is abundant, and that any minister who does not think so must be "unco worldly."

Now, be it remembered that very few of our ministers have a parsonage, much less a farm, from the products of which to feed and clothe their families; while, on the other hand, their expenditure necessarily includes many items almost unknown to the majority of the people. *House-rent*, and the keep of a *horse*, which cost the farmer no cash outlay, and are therefore not reckoned at all in his expenditure, often consume *one-third* of a minister's income. His *library*, so essential to his growth and freshness as a preacher of the gospel, needs to be constantly replenished with the latest and best publications within his reach; and even a few good books every year make a large draft upon his resources. Then, a minister and his family are expected to *dress* well, as well, at least, as the most respectable of his congregation, even if their means are five times as great. He must also *live* well, or some of those who share his hospitality will make remarks, and scandalize his wife as "no cook," or "a poor manager." He must be a pattern of *liberality* towards every good object, general as well as denominational. He is necessitated to *travel* much, to do which wears out a great deal of clothing, and costs a great deal of money. And lastly, being like the Levites of old, without any portion among his brethren, and his family, therefore, without the provision which he, in common with every man, ought to endeavour to make for them in the event of his death, he will probably *insure his life*, and secure, by annual payment of a large sum of money, the competency which his parishioner leaves behind him in his farm.

Now, put all these *extras* together—rent, horse-keep, library, dress, life-assurance, travelling expenses, and the various claims upon his benevolence