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Rev. and Dear Sir,

I thank you for directing my attention to the very able Pamphlet enclosed, on the sad inadequacy of the Salaries of our Clergy.

Its publication and extensive distribution throughout Canada would, I think, be of great benefit to the members of the Church, both Clergy and Laity.

Our congregations might, from its perusal, become more thoroughly alive to the pressing wants of their spiritual instructors, and feel that the duty of making far better, and, where possible, more liberal provision for them and their families, was not one of indifference, but of solemn and religious obligation. If delicately and conscientiously exercised, it would seldom fail, not only to stir up the Clergy when beginning to despond, but add holy fire to their ministerial zeal, which never burns so bright as not to acquire fresh strength and expansion by the affectionate and seasonable acknowledgments of their people.

I remain,

Rev. and dear Sir,

Your faithful Brother,

John Toronto.

The Reverend Doctor Patton.
INTRODUCTION.

The following able article, though written by a Presbyter of this Diocese, was, (as indicated by the title-page,) originally published in the “Church Review” for July, 1857.* It was subsequently re-published in pamphlet form by “The Society for Diffusing Christian Knowledge in the Diocese of Mississippi,” prefaced by an able address from the Bishop of that Diocese, the Right Rev. Wm. Mercer Green. This address is omitted in the present re-publication, on account of its many local allusions, the concluding sentences only being here introduced. “Let me entreat you then, brethren, (saith the Bishop to his laity,) to read the following article with serious attention, and with earnest self-inquiry whether each and all of you, in your several stations, are doing what lies in your power towards the support of God’s Ministry. Upon the answer which your heart gives to this solemn question may depend your peace here, and your salvation hereafter.”

The writer has also seen a letter from the American publisher, in which it is stated that the article had been warmly commended by many excellent Clergymen and by several Laymen, eminent for their literary acquirements, and that, moreover, it had been honoured with the cordial approval of no less than nine Bishops of the sister Church in the United States.

It is now commended to the serious attention of the members of the Church in this Diocese, with the sanction and approval of your own venerable and beloved Diocesan, whose opinion of its merits is the more valuable from his well-known vigour of intellect, soundness of judgment, and literary attainments; while from his ardent desire for the advancement of the Redeemer’s Kingdom, and his

intimate knowledge of the condition of the Church amongst us, he is equally well qualified to judge of the means proposed for its further advancement and prosperity.

The writer feels assured, that by obtaining from its gifted author permission to re-publish the article in Canada, he is aiding in doing good service to the cause of Christ’s Church. Limited as its circulation in this Diocese has hitherto been, the instances could, nevertheless, be named, in which its perusal by two laymen caused each of them to double his subscription to their clergyman.

Perhaps its re-publication could never be more seasonable or appropriate than at the present moment, when the universal cry of hard times meets with a sadly responsive echo from the hearts of those amongst our clergy who are dependent for their support chiefly, or entirely, upon the voluntary principle. Many of these, it is to be feared, are being practically dealt with, as was that American Clergyman, who, after inculcating the duty of retrenchment and economy as suited to the times, was far more astonished than gratified with the announcement, on the following day, that his vestry, profiting by his exhortations, had already begun to practise the duties he had so eloquently enforced, and had accordingly retrenched their expenses by reducing his salary one half.

It is, in truth, too often the case, that by their diminished contributions to the support of their Clergy, and to other religious or charitable objects, men first evince that they are sensible of “the hardness of the times.” Even though there be no alteration in their style of living,—though their dress be as extravagant, and their entertainments as costly as before, yet, let the appeal be made for any religious object, and too frequently it is met by the chilling assurance that it is impossible to give any thing “these hard times.” Hard, indeed, they should be, when they exercise so hardening an influence in steeling men’s hearts against the claims of God’s Church, or God’s poor.

When will men learn really and practically to believe that what they have is not their own; that it belongs to God; that they are responsible to Him for the manner in which they employ the possessions entrusted to them; and that He demands an acknowledgment of that trust in their liberal support of every charitable and religious object, in proportion to the means vouchsafed to them from His undeserved bounty.
But this, and kindred topics, are so ably discussed in the following article, that the present writer will no longer detain its readers from the gratification which he trusts its perusal will afford; he therefore concludes with the earnest prayer that its re-publication in Canada may, by the Divine blessing, be productive of great good to the cause of Christ and His Church.

H. PATTON.

CORNWALL, Feb. 1st, 1858.

P. S.—The writer desires also to direct attention to the three extracts which form the Appendix. Two of them are taken from secular, and one from a semi-religious and semi-secular paper. He regards it as a favourable omen of better things, when the secular press thus plainly and faithfully enunciate such sound doctrine on this important subject.

H. P.
PRAYER.

Almighty and most merciful God, giver of all spiritual grace, who hast blessed us with the ministry of reconciliation, and hast taught us that Thy labourers are worthy of their reward, put, we beseech Thee, into the hearts of us and all Thy people such love for Thy Church and for their faithful Ministers as may incline us ever to esteem them worthy of all honour, and to be ready at all times to uphold and cherish them for Thy sake, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

SALARIES OF THE CLERGY.

From the Church Review, July, 1857.

Is there any assignable reason why the services of a Clergyman should be received and enjoyed almost gratuitously, while other professional men are remunerated as a matter of course? We should wish much to see an essay or tract written in defence of the custom of restricting the incomes of the Clergy to such a limit as makes the support of their families one continued struggle. We should have much pleasure in replying to its arguments. But as those arguments have not been published, we shall endeavour to imagine them, and in this paper make some remarks on their validity. Before, however, entering on the discussion with such Christian politico-economists, a word or two of preface may not be out of place.

All Christians speak of “the one thing needful.” There is no difference of opinion concerning the tendency of Christ's religion to promote happiness, and further civilization, yet, strange to say, the class of men whose whole time and thought are devoted to the cause which men profess to love so well, are the worst paid, and the most laboriously worked of any body of educated men in the community. A physician who visits family after family professionally, is deemed a “labourer worthy of his hire;” but a Clergyman, whose office it is to step into a sick man's room, not for a few minutes only, but to
remain hour after hour, administering such consolation as religion alone can give, must inhale the noxious vapor of infectious disease, as a matter of privilege to himself; he is sometimes considered deserving of gratitude, but generally nothing else. The praise of Miss Nightingale is in all the Churches, because with heroic spirit she voluntarily exposed herself to death on her errand of mercy. Yet hers is no isolated case, a something which never occurs in the annals of the Church. It was her sex and station in life that formed the peculiarity of her case, and helped to attach to her name such enviable distinction. Now, does it never strike the Christian public, that in every city and town are to be found men, who have forsaken the comfort of home, and the prospects of ambition which other professions afford, for the purpose of walking through hospitals, visiting sick and afflicted families, and exposing themselves to dangers from which men who were not devoted to Christ would inevitably shrink. And this, and much more, they do for a pittance enough to support life, but not sufficient to maintain respectability. A lawyer, who holds a brief from a client, demands and is paid his fee, whether he be successful or not in pleading his case; but a Minister—an ambassador holding a brief from God, and pleading day after day with the ungodly and profane—is thought worthy of such remuneration as a skilful mechanic would disdain. Hence we have the anomaly of a people spending on a cause they profess to have most at heart, less money than on most other items of ordinary expenditure. Professions indeed so much outrun performance, that were it not for some artificial spurs to benevolence, we should witness still more deplorable results in the Church. Perhaps at last profession might come to be considered so availing that the cry of “Lord, Lord,” would be substituted altogether for “Doing the things which He said.”

Fortunately, as the world is circumstanced, it is creditable to character to speak of the progress of the gospel; it tends to respectability to appear to take an interest in ecclesiastical affairs. Many men, therefore, do pay money enough to maintain character and respectability, but far from enough to prove them, in the estimation of scripture or reason, either honest or conscientious. Unworthy motives, of various other descriptions, help to fill the coffers of the Church. The steady conservative, who is fearful of revolution, and dreads the name of socialism, gives his five dollars to a mission fund, because he regards missionaries (as they are) as a moral police to
preserve the knowledge and practice of morality in the commonwealth. The wealthy capitalist does the same, because Christian honesty is essential to the healthy progress of commerce, and gives his mite, (as he calls it,) to convey the idea that he deserves to share the commendation bestowed by our Redeemer on one who gave all her living to God's treasury. The successful man of the world, or the thriving farmer, gives his subscription to his Pastor's salary, because in his settlement the society of an educated Clergyman is such an acquisition, and a Church in the neighbourhood improves his property.

But we shall refrain from any further imputation of motives. We have no desire to appear cynical, though in all honesty we protest that we might truly attribute even baser motives than these to many other classes of society in their contributions to religious purposes. It makes us sad to consider the result to the Church, were all the gifts to her support which originate in selfishness suddenly deducted from her resources. "We believe and therefore speak," and are driven to our conclusions sorely against our will by overwhelming evidence. The Clergy as a body are kept at starvation point. The problem which the laity seem striving earnestly to solve is this, "What is the minimum amount of support compatible with moderate clerical efficiency?" We cannot help imputing base motives to the donors, when the recipients of their gifts are said to be an indispensable requisite, and their duties the most solemn imaginable, and yet the former are penuriously dealt with, and the latter miserably paid for. Should a man profess to value a Bible beyond gold and silver, and yet pay for it with a bad grace, striving to reduce its price and procure it at the uttermost farthing of abatement, we should doubt his veracity. Should a sick man, with protestations, declare that he believed fervently in the efficacy of a certain medicine, and yet make but little exertion and no sacrifice to obtain it, we should think him bent either on suicide or hypocrisy. Similarly, we cannot evade the inference, that the bulk of nominal Christians who read that "Even so hath the Lord ordained that they who preach the gospel, shall live of the gospel," are wickedly inconsistent, if they believe the text, and sadly hypocritical if they disbelieve it.

Now, we ought to look for some way of accounting for this widespread deviation from principle in the matter of clerical maintenance. Selfishness, alone, cannot account for it. It must have some ap-
parent assistance from expediency, or supposed sound reasoning. Because when a defect springs from pure selfishness, there is a remedy to be found in exposing it, till what is not done from a sense of duty, is at last done from a sense of shame. A mere exposition, however, of the hardships of clerical life, of the difficulties the Clergy have to encounter in providing food and raiment for their families, of the pangs they have to endure from the humiliating process in which even what is given them is doled out,—a detailed statement of such grievances would perform but little good, and that little only temporarily. We must not only shame men into compliance with the requirements of the Bible, but convince them of the fallacy of those arguments by which their selfishness is fostered. And we know of no excuse for selfishness more prevalent or more successful than the oft-repeated argument, that if the Clergy were too well paid, there would be at once a temptation to young men to enter the sacred ministry from inferior motives. This is a pitiable apology for parsimony. Does it follow that because assiduous and competent Clergy are adequately paid, that the unprincipled or incompetent must be paid equally, or even employed at all? Because honest and industrious tradesmen are well remunerated, dishonest and idle men will no doubt learn trades, but must they necessarily be employed or receive high wages? The argument again is irrelavent, for the question is not whether the Clergy should be too well paid, not whether they should receive more than enough, but whether it be not the duty of the Church to see that they have a sufficiency. And besides its irrelevancy, the argument proves too much. For if the average income of a Clergyman (say $500 per annum) be at present a security that unworthy motives will not actuate candidates for the ministry, an income of $100 would make the security still more secure. Nay, a promise of food and raiment alone, would make the guarantee still stronger.

It is worth considering also, that in all trades and professions the great majority never attain beyond a mere living; they are but able to live and nothing more. This fact, however, does not prevent thousands from daily recruiting the ranks of those professions. Why, then, does not the same rule hold good in the clerical profession? Why are Clergymen more difficult to be procured, than tradesmen or lawyers? Clearly because they are not paid as well, proportionally, as other labourers, as also because there is an utter
disparity between their income and the status in society they are expected to maintain. The fact, therefore, that the supply of Clergy is quite inadequate to the demand, proves incontestably that they are more inadequately paid than any other profession, because experience shows that multitudes enter on avocations in every other grade of life, while the chances are incalculable against their even obtaining beyond a tolerable livelihood. Now, when we would claim for the Clergy suitable provision, it is no answer to talk of the ill-results likely to follow from a luxurious provision; when the Clergy are assimilated to other professional men in the payment of their labours, it will be time enough to quell the alarms of the objector. But let us suppose for a moment, that the stipends of the Clergy were such as to render the Ministry a desirable profession in a worldly point of view, we ask, is it not better that young men should be attracted to the work of evangelizing the world, even though the motives at first were not wholly disinterested, than that the work should languish and die through want of labourers altogether? Suppose the number of candidates for holy orders largely increased owing to greater liberality in clerical maintenance, may we not say with St. Paul, “What then? Notwithstanding every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is preached, and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice.”

Again, are those persons who are so scrupulous in reference to the purity of motive with which the Clergy should be influenced, and who make their scruples a pretext for economy—are such persons equally scrupulous in not throwing any obstacle in the way of clerical devotedness? Do they require in the Clergy an abnegation of self merely, or do they not add to the load of self-denial by requiring in general that the Clergy should be married men? Do they demand that unalloyed disinterestedness should actuate the Clergy in taking orders? So far, well, but why call on them in addition literally “to hate wife and children?” It may be quite reasonable to demand that the ministry of reconciliation be not accepted for filthy lucre sake, but why insist on a Minister absolutely crushing the feelings of a man, and exhibiting to the world an illustration of one who cares not to “provide for his own household,” placidly indifferent to his children’s future welfare, or their present education? True it is, that the Saviour declared that when wife and children are brought into competition with him,
they should be forsaken by the true disciple, but He never made
the test so afflictive as to impose matrimony on his Ministers as an
indispensable condition of ministerial usefulness.

But the world is more exacting than its Redeemer. It is no-
rious that congregations are dissatisfied unless their Pastors are mar-
rried, and that every imaginable method is used to intimate their
wishes on the subject to their ministers. It is whispered, what an
advantage to the success of his labours it would prove, were he only
married; how useful in his parochial work a prudent wife might
make herself; these and such like observations are continued until
he is made to believe that marriage is a duty he owes to the Church,
and thus is an additional weight of care and responsibility heaped
on a Minister, already, it may be, sufficiently embarrassed in his
effort to maintain a respectable appearance in society. Let those
persons, then, whose scruples prevent them from assisting to main-
tain the Clergy in comfort and independence, on the ground that
there should be no temptations of a selfish kind to clerical life, take
the subject of celibacy into their serious consideration. Few men
like to take on them a vow, or, what is equivalent, a necessity of
living in a state of celibacy. Let celibacy then be made a sine qua non with candidates for orders, and our objectors will have a
still surer guarantee for purity of motive, while they will have the
gratification of knowing that they are more merciful, as well as
more consistent.

There can be no doubt of the fact that many worthy men are
deterred from the sacred Ministry by the belief that they are not
called upon to expose their families to hardships which they would
willingly encounter as individuals. Now, a competent provision for
the Clergy, while it would take away this plea for refraining from the
work of the Ministry, would never of itself be sufficient (to the
extent supposed) to induce persons to assume the responsibility of
the Clerical profession from unworthy motives. When we remem-
ber that we must look for our principal supply of Clergy from the
various theological schools, and that the bulk of the candidates will
be derived from classes of young men who have to submit to long
training prior to their ordination, there can be little danger lest the
ranks of the Clergy be filled up from the refuse of other professions,
or with men who would accept a competency in the Church which
they could not earn either in trade or literature. We would, there-
fore, express our honest conviction that the danger to be appre-
hended from the attraction of young men by competent provision for the Clergy, is not worthy to be compared with the practical loss sustained in the repulsion of excellent men by an incompetent provision.

It is also seldom duly reflected on that the Clerical profession differs from all others in this respect, that the Clergy, on taking upon themselves the vows of their sacred calling, must renounce all ambition—the severest of all struggles to a gifted or aspiring mind. Let a Clergyman become settled as a Parish Priest, in nineteen-twentieths of cases he is at the top of his profession. It is easy to speak of his highest ambition as being by right necessarily centred in making converts and filling his churches. True, indeed, such is the only ambition of multitudes; but is there no sacrifice in thus entering on a career in which the highest preferment is all at once gained, and where the same round of duties, with perhaps lessening remuneration, and grave apprehensions for the fate of their declining years, forms the daily task of their natural life? Would it not be considered a hard fate for a medical or legal practitioner to be informed in the days of his health and activity, that when his professional income reached the sum of $400 or $600 per annum, he was to make no further progress in ambition or wealth? These are considerations that are becoming more and more significant. In a country like this, where, amid free institutions and innumerable avenues to wealth and importance, a young man is excusable for aspiring to the highest honours, and most influential positions in society, it is self-evident that a candidate for the Clerical profession must make sacrifices. Give him, we say, a competency to live on, (and that is all we contend for), and still there will remain a balance of self-denial sufficient to deter, in the great majority of instances, from the vows of ordination, unless the candidate be impelled by a desire to promote the honour of God and the edification of His Church.

But we will now look at this subject from another point of view. Admitting that the provision made for the maintenance of the Clergy were such as would attract and not repel young men from the profession, still we contend that the evil likely to arise from the operation of base motives on the part of some candidates would be more than counterbalanced by the improvement that would be felt in the learning, talent, and general superiority of the Clergy. The more numerous the aspirants, the larger the field from which the eccle-
siastical authority can make selection. We hold it to be an obvious
principle that it is (or should be) a desideratum in the Church to
make that body to whose care are entrusted the solemn interests
of man's eternal welfare, conspicuous for its ability and erudition.
It is a matter of the greatest importance that the Clergy be not
allowed to degenerate as a class. In these days, when the adver-
sary of the soul is so ably assisted by genius and learning enlisted
on the side of infidelity, a thoroughly educated and able Ministry
are of inestimable importance to the progress, nay, the very
character of the Church. And while treating of this subject, we
would not have our remarks misunderstood, as though we disbe-
lieved the Scripture, which says, "the wisdom of this world is
foolishness with God." We are far from placing reliance on man's
unaided ability to bring the gospel home with power to the soul.
But as God has no need of man's talent and philosophy, when He
would spread His gospel and enlarge the borders of His Church,
so we believe that neither is ignorance nor mediocrity of talent
essential to the success of Christianity. On the most sublime
of topics let the highest intellect be expended, and it will not be
expended in vain. Would that we might reasonably anticipate the
prospect of witnessing the same amount of skill, accomplishment
and ability, which mark the world of trade or politics, made subserv-
vient to the glorious task of defending true religion, and preaching
the word of the living God. Therefore, should a marked improve-
ment in the temporal condition of the Clergy be the means of
augmenting the number of applicants for holy orders, we contend
that any selfishness of motive on the part of some candidates
would be more than counterbalanced by the facility afforded to our
Bishops and congregations of selecting from a larger supply the
most "apt and meet for their learning and godly conversation."

But we fancy we hear the objector of the class who give
"grudgingly and of necessity," asserting that the Clergy are paid
well enough, considering what they have to do. Here, again, we
must join issue, and state our belief that no class of men perform
more work under more trying and discouraging circumstances. Of
course, the labours of the Clergy are not of that nature that publicity
attends them all, and therefore they are comparatively unknown;
but it would be a tedious task to enumerate the various items
which go to make up a Clergyman's constant duty. There are
two or more sermons to be composed each week, written with the
knowledge that they are liable to criticism, for delivery, composition and doctrine. This labour is, perhaps, the best known and appreciated of his duties, though the difficulty of keeping up the interest of a congregation, requiring as it does research and novelty in idea and expression, is not fully understood; especially as care is generally taken to avoid even the appearance of repeating an old sermon, however admirable in composition, or suitable to the occasion, it being considered a crime in a Clergyman to be detected in such guilty economy of labour. But, besides the preparation of sermons, and attendance on burials, and other rites of the Church, which are considered by some as a Clergyman's only duty, there is the ceaseless round of visiting,—a labour which, like upheaving the stone of Sisyphus, is completed only to be renewed; the attention to the parochial and Sunday school, in keeping both teachers and children interested in the work and regular in attendance; the visitation of the sick; the painful, ever recurring duty that springs from being brought into contact with scenes of suffering, whether the result of sickness, destitution, or crime;* the applications of the poor for assistance, and the emigrant for advice; the confirmation class and the Bible class; the collection of funds for benevolent objects in general, but especially for the building of Churches, (this latter duty both distasteful and thankless, being for the most part imposed on the Clergy, who, like the mendicant friars of former days, itinerate on the business of their congregations;) the lectures at mechanics' institutes and literary associations;—these are but a part of the routine of duty which must be performed in any tolerably populous parish, and they constitute, in the aggregate, severe labour, accompanied with great mental anxiety.

* The visitation and relief of the poor and destitute sick are generally considered part of a Clergyman's duty; but, for the most part, the Clergy are not treated considerately in this matter. The laity too often forget how distressing must be the feelings of a Clergyman who has no alms to bestow from the offerings of his flock, and but little to give out of his own purse, in consequence of the smallness of his stipend. He is obliged to undergo the sad ordeal of saying to the poor and sick, "Be ye warmed and filled," while they who employ him to perform this duty for them—a duty severely felt by every humane and sensitive mind— withholding the alms without which it is hard to make the poor believe that their visitor is sincere. Application is made to the Clergy on every occasion of collections in aid of religious or charitable institutions, and their inability to meet the demands on their charity is often a source of bitter regret. They would wish to set an example of liberality, but they cannot—the luxury is denied them.
If this be a fair statement of a Clergyman's labour, (and who
that is acquainted with the working of a parish can doubt it?) let
us see how he is remunerated. Having considered what he has to
do, let us reflect on what he has to suffer. In the first place, the
average income of the Clergy is miserably small; but the manner
in which they are paid makes the matter still worse. The sub-
scription list which should be promptly redeemed when due, is the
source of many bitter feelings. A portion of the sum subscribed
reaches the Minister, but it is accompanied with the remarks of the
subscribers, which never fail to reach his ears. There is the
humiliating inuendo that the money is given from any other motive
than love or respect; the feeling brought home to the Clergyman
that some of his supporters imagine that with their subscriptions
they have purchased the right to dictate to him on all manner of
subjects; he is made aware that some of his parishioners accuse
him of this fault, or that neglect; by some he is charged with
neglecting the poor, by others with courting the rich; and these
rumours are specially rife on pay day. A few honest-hearted indi-
viduals, however, bring the subscription list nearly through the
ordeal, and the result is, that the minister is paid, though a balance
be left due; and who, except the victim to such selfishness, can
fully enter into the feelings of a pastor thus treated by his flock?
With hope and sanguine expectations he entered on his charge,
pleased with his work for its own sake; liberal himself, he expected
liberality; and honest in his belief in Scripture and the Lord's
ordination, that they "who preach the gospel should live of the
gospel," he hoped to receive cheerfully-paid remuneration. But
after a few years of struggle with pecuniary difficulties, with an
increasing family, and it may be, impaired health, having received
his stipend, or a portion of it, more as reluctant alms than as honest
wages, can we wonder if he sinks under such a load, either into sad
despondency or callous indifference? Are we to feel surprised, if,
when food and raiment for their families are made dependent on
their keeping in the good graces of a wealthy parishioner, that some
should fall into the snare and barter their independence of conduct
for bread? Or, is it to be accounted strange, that a high-minded,
impulsive Clergyman, accused of such truckling to the great, should
be tempted to offer unnecessary opposition or slight to an influen-
tial parishioner, in his eagerness to prove the independence of his
character.
There is, moreover, an additional sting in such treatment of a Minister. The debt which is due is one of honour, not of legal obligation. He therefore feels that he is indeed neglected or despised when such a debt is repudiated by Christian men. His case is also peculiarly helpless: should he apply himself to trading, farming, or speculation, notwithstanding every excuse of necessity, his character as a Clergyman would be compromised and his usefulness materially lessened. Retreat from his position is impossible; the "vows of God are upon him": before him lie heartlessness and opposition; and behind him, the resource of secular employment which he may not attempt as dishonouring to his profession. Ardently, therefore, and emphatically do we adopt the language of the Bishop of Illinois in his convention address: "Any thing that can give the defenceless Minister who would and does suffer most deeply rather than complain, who would die rather than treat this sacred debt—on record with acknowledgment in God's book—as a question for an earthly suit; any thing that can make him officially protected by the Church's sentiment and inquiry, will be of deep use and expanding effect, in its ramified influence for the purity and progress of the Church in our land."

The more, indeed, we reflect on this subject the more amazing do we regard the treatment of God's Ministers by the mass of professing Christians. Considering that, as a class, they do not thrust themselves on the people who undertake their support, but enter on their duties by the solicitation and at the call of a number of highly respectable individuals, we must admit the existence of a criminal neglect of the precept "owe no man any thing." Should a parish be vacant, or the organization of a new one be contemplated, the newspapers teem with regret at the religious destitution of the locality. There is a general commiseration excited, and an unprejudiced spectator would suppose that the presence of a resident Minister would be not only hailed as a boon, but paid for as a valued blessing. A Clergyman is sought for, and earnestly solicited to undertake the cure. He consents with hopeful anticipations, and the result too generally is such as we have attempted to detail. There is (it is true) a general demand on the part of the people for perfection of character and accomplishments in their Minister, and of course they are always disappointed; but it seems seldom to enter into their heads that it is well nigh impossible for a Clergyman to enter heart and soul into his duties unless he is at least
independent in circumstances, so as to be able to meet the fair
demands of his creditors. And yet a Clergyman, no more that
any other man, can sit down to his work, to the composition of
sermons, or proceed to visit his flock effectively, if his mind be
burthened with the dread of want in his family, or the still graver
apprehension lest after all his preaching to others he should be
compelled to appear himself as a bankrupt. He naturally broods
over in his mind the ingratitude or the thoughtlessness of his
people. He thinks it but reasonable that the Church which
required him to spend a large sum on a theological education, should
pay at least moderate interest on his expenditure. He finds every
day more and more necessity for study and research, in order that
he may preach to advantage and cope on equal terms with the
sceptic and schismatic, and yet he finds also that his slender pittance,
doled out, too, not as stipend, but alms, is barely adequate to the
support of life, so that nothing is left to enable him to increase his
library, or even to purchase a periodical. Now we protest that
this is a fair statement of the treatment of multitudes of worthy
talented and learned men; and we shall refuse to take as an excuse
for it any insinuations about the precedent of the fishermen of
Galilee, and the good of souls being a reward in itself, until we see
that a self-denying zeal and a threadbare coat become a passport
to the good graces of our congregations.

Let us, however, pass from the consideration of clerical support
to the wide subject of Church support in general. And the more
we scan and examine the whole system, the more fully must every
unprejudiced man be impressed with the idea that there is an almost
total lack of evangelical motive influencing the contributors. We
miss any traces of self-denial, sacrifice, abnegation of self, in short,
yany symptoms of acquiescence in the common sense observation
of David, “I will not offer sacrifice unto the Lord, my God, of that
which doth cost me nothing.” The far greater facility of building
Churches than of supporting Ministers arises in great measure
notoriously from the fact that the former adds much to the value of
property, while the latter is of course a constant demand on the
resources of the people. Wherever we can see that there is
tangible or apparent value received, we invariably find money
freely given for religious purposes. Hence the popularity of
soirees, tea meetings, bazaars, donation parties, and eloquent
preachers; in each and every one of these devices for gratifying self
to the glory of God, we can on analysis detect the base precipitate of value received. In a leading newspaper we lately observed an advertisement of a soiree with a remark of approval by the editor, because "the soiree was now become one of our settled religious institutions." The funds arising from the sale of tickets of admission to a pleasant gossiping tea party, are devoted to the sacred purposes of erecting a Church or converting the heathen; and should the proceeds be large, or (what is equivalent) should the party be a taking one, the revellers are dismissed with the benediction and an address of congratulation "for the grace of God bestowed on the Church of——."

Again, multitudes expend money largely at bazaars, who never give largely at any other time or place, just because they get something for their money, or are seduced into a temporary benevolence by the importunate raillery of ladies. True it is, we can imagine a bazaar got up under admissible circumstances; were the articles for sale made exclusively by persons who had little or no money to give to religious purposes, and who were yet desirous to aid a good work with the labour of their hands, while the purchasers were persons who did not confine their liberality to such occasions, buying for the express purpose of affording to the makers of the goods for sale the wished for privilege of assisting (in their only possible way) the object in view, then we regard the design as a good one, and allowable on gospel principles. But it makes us shudder with apprehension for the fate of men, who, with motives the most selfish and earthly, can point to the Church or parsonage (erected by the exertions of a few earnest-minded women) as a proof of the liberality of the congregation, with whom they worship Him, "who, though He was rich, yet for their sake became poor." With precisely similar feelings, we regard donation visits, when made a pretext for an evening's amusement, or subscriptions to support an eloquent preacher, when little or nothing can be obtained to maintain a zealous Parish Priest, who attaches more importance to the prayers of the Church and the worship of God than to preaching to the people, and devotes more time to parochial visiting than to such discourses as may tickle the fastidious ears of his flock. Indeed, the more deeply we ponder upon the rise and progress of these protestant carnivals and Christian saturnalia, the more amazed we become at the sad self-delusion of professing Christians. No jesuitical sophistry, no fine drawing of texts, can
by any possibility reconcile the manner of giving to God which now prevails, with the spirit of the gospel or the offertory sentences of the Church; and we are driven to the conclusion that the prevalent practice of endeavouring to serve at once God and Mammon, must spring from unbelief.

It may be said that the majority of contributors are really under the delusion that what they give is quite respectable and proportionate to their means and God's requirements. It may be so, but this admission must be made at the expense either of their consistency or their understanding. There is no palliation for such delusion, but either neglect of the Bible or misunderstanding it. If the former be the cause, there must exist a melancholy inconsistency between profession and practice. If the latter, there must be a lamentable deficiency of intellect when the scriptural doctrine of giving to the glory of God can be misinterpreted. We know, indeed, that the delusion we speak of is in a great degree fostered by the public press. A trifling donation to a Minister, or a paltry subscription to a Church, is often alluded to under the flattering heading, "Munificent Donation," or "Handsome Present." We clip (as an instance) the following announcement from the columns of an influential journal:

"Handsome Present to a Clergyman.—We understand that a series of meetings at S——school house in R——, under the labours of the Rev. Mr.——, have resulted in the conversion of about fifty souls, many of whom are heads of families. On Friday night, when the Rev. gentleman was about to close the meeting for the night, he was interrupted by his congregation, while they proceeded to pay over to one of their number $40, for the purpose of purchasing him a new cutter."

Observe in this announcement the lamentable naïveté with which it is intimated that $40 was a handsome present from fifty converted souls to their Minister, being less than a dollar each for their conversion.

We give another notice of a different description, illustrating the mode in which gospel charity is made compatible with "fleshly lusts that war against the soul."

"The ladies' circle of the Universalist Society, at Utica, will hold their annual festival at Mechanics' Hall, on Thursday next. They will give an oyster supper, and Smith's quadrille band will be in attendance. Tickets $1. The avails of the festival will be appro.
priated towards paying off the organ debt.” Here we are openly informed that any money that shall be available after the company have regaled themselves with oysters, and amused themselves with dancing, ad libitum, any remnant of the funds after expenses are defrayed, shall be applied to payment for an organ, wherewith to “praise God in His holiness and the firmanent of His power.” Such extracts might be multiplied at will, and the most disheartening feature of the case arises from the fact that the press does not lead public opinion, but follows it on such matters. It may and does foster, but cannot create such a perversion of right judgment as calls “the vile man liberal or the churl bountiful.” No, this unscriptural standard of motive and extent in our donations to God, has become so ingrained in the Christian public, that nothing but a total revolution of sentiment, arising from a prayerful and impartial study of the scriptures, will force men into the right, though long neglected path of duty—THE DUTY OF GIVING, AS A MINIMUM, ONE-TENTH OF OUR INCOME TO THE TREASURY OF GOD.

We are, however, in this article, concerned chiefly with the question of clerical maintenance, though it is difficult to treat of it without allusion to the general question of Church support. Space will not permit us to extend our remarks to this general question, further than to lay down the principle of self-denial as a necessary qualification for rendering our good works acceptable to God. No one (as far as we know) dreams of disavowing this Gospel principle as an unnecessary one; and yet, plain as it is in operation, and scriptural as it is in theory, it is a stranger to the great mass of Christian people practically. So evidently is this principle connected with religious profession theoretically, that the Clergy are required to become practical illustrations of it. Unless a Clergyman is a self-denying man, he is lightly esteemed. Now we claim for the Clergy, as a body, a self-denying character. Rightly and scripturally do they deserve it, but we protest against the attempt to perform any Christian duty by proxy. The devotedness of the Clergy will not atone for the illiberality of the laity. It will not make amends for the parsimony of men who fare sumptuously every day, that their spiritual teachers were forced to assume compulsory vows of poverty, “Every man must give account of himself to God.” An idea, springing from the absence of self-denial in the laity, is a main cause of the poverty of the Clergy. We mean the erroneous opinion that the obligation to support them extends no further than
payment can be demanded from their congregations for services rendered to the members individually. On this principle, a man who attends divine service regularly every Sunday, is bound to pay twice as much as one who attends alternate Sundays only. The convenience of having a Minister to officiate, and the advantage taken of such convenience, are the only items of consideration when payment is demanded. It is forgotten that every Christian is, on gospel principles, a missionary.* He must either personally or by others, preach the gospel. Though incapacity, caused by illness, age, or distance from the house of God, should prevent any from individually profiting by the ordinances of the Church, the duty still lies on them to see that the poor have the gospel preached to them, and that the work of evangelizing the world be not retarded through want of means, so long as they possess the power of assisting the labourers. This view of the matter is almost wholly ignored. The subscription, or pew rent is paid, as remuneration for the enjoyment of the sermon, or the convenience of the seat, with total neglect of fellow Christians who have neither one or the other. And what is the effect on the world at large? Infidelity is greatly promoted by this conduct of believers. The unbelieving man of the world sees the cushioned pew with its velvet apparatus and luxurious accommodations, rented according to its value, on the same principle precisely as a box at the opera. He sees, moreover, in many instances, the occupant limiting his donations to the cause of religion to that rent. There is no trace of self-denial, and the worldling naturally concludes that this church-going is the man’s foible, like a taste for articles of virtu, or literary refinement; it is his hobby, and that he neither cares for his brethren, nor believes, himself, in the doctrines of the Church.

* Since the above was written the celebrated Missionary, the Rev. Dr. Livingstone, has published his researches in Africa, and writes thus, page 40 of his work, “The command to go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature, must be obeyed by Christians either personally or by substitute. Now it is quite possible to find men whose love for the heathen and devotion to the work will make them ready to go forth on the terms “bare subsistence;” but what can be thought of the justice, to say nothing of the generosity of Christians and Churches, who not only work their substitutes at the lowest terms, but regard what they give as charity! The matter is the more grave in respect to the protestant missionary, who may have a wife and family. The fact is, there are many cases in which it is right, virtuous and praiseworthy for a man to sacrifice every thing for a great object, but in which it would be very wrong for others interested in the object as much as he, to suffer or accept the sacrifice, if they can prevent it.”

The above extract is quite as applicable to the home as to the foreign missionary.
Such is one evil arising from the absence of self-denial in our offerings. Another, of course, is the utter disproportion between the contributions of the Church and the necessities of the times. It is no reply to our strictures to point to the number of Churches and the respectable appearance of the Clergy in our cities. There is no more self-denial in the cities than in the rural districts; the more efficient support of the Clergy in the former, is due more to the number and wealth of their parishioners than to self-denial. Not unfrequently such parishes contain single individuals, a tithe of whose income would exceed the whole expenses of the parish and their charities besides. And then a small sum from each member assumes in the aggregate quite respectable proportions; and yet even in such favoured localities, there is room for more Ministers and more Churches. Besides, cities, attracting as they do the ablest of the Clergy, no doubt exhibit all the results likely to follow brilliant appeals and talented labour. We therefore affirm, that not even in the most apparently prosperous phases of clerical maintenance, is there evident proof of a self-denying evangelical principle being the actuating motive of Christian churchmen. And as a necessary consequence of the poverty of the Clergy, restlessness ensues, a desire of shifting and changing from one sphere of duty to another, an evil now so prevalent as to call for the warning voice of our Bishops. The restriction of the gifts of the laity to a standard regulated by avarice, the supposed value of clerical duty, or the amount given by richer neighbours, has entailed poverty on the Clergy, and the evil of constant change on parishes.

The truth is, penury is no recommendation to a Clergyman, however holy he may be. Piety in rags, in vain seeks admission to our pulpits, or the entree to our drawing-rooms. This the Clergy well know. They feel that if unable to maintain a decent exterior, the poor will be tempted to despise them, and the rich to neglect them. Naturally, therefore, do they seek for a parish where a better income will enable them to do their duty under more favourable circumstances and from a more commanding position, and thus does the lack of suitable maintenance lead to the constant removal so prevalent, and snaps asunder a bond of love and respect which a long period of intercourse engenders between a Clergyman and his flock.

Complete worldliness of motive in giving, is also a main stay of the pew system. A large amount of stipend reaches the Clergy
under that system, which, (unless the grace of God prevent the evil,) would otherwise never be obtained. A pew holder, who is dissatisfied with his Minister, will not, for the most part, punish himself by surrendering his pew, in order to annoy his Pastor. The pew system being a species of indirect taxation, from the proceeds of which the executive officers of the Church are paid, affords, in many cases, a better, always a more certain income than a subscription list. And as the payment of indirect taxation does not necessarily entitle a man to the name of patriot, similarly the payment of pew rent cannot obtain for a Christian the character of "a cheerful giver." A man will not deprive his family of the luxuries of life because an unpopular secretary of state is paid his salary out of taxes on such luxuries; there is, therefore, no patriotism in the payment of indirect taxation. But should a political emergency arise, and the treasury be well nigh empty, then, indeed, if a man come forward and subscribe liberally in his country's aid, he would earn for himself the title of patriot. Now, there is ever such an emergency in the Church of Christ; and he alone who pays his contribution, without reference to any return in the shape of an easy pew, or a pleasing sermon, deserves the designation of a good and faithful servant of Christ. The result of such a state of things is this, that the Clergy of two evils choose the least, and prefer the certain income from pew rents to the very uncertain one from voluntary donations. They are thus directly interested in supporting a system which is fearfully retarding the popularity and growth of the Church. Only let the laity once show their practical belief in the doctrine that every baptised Christian is bound to give, not according to caprice, but "as God has prospered him," and forthwith, as far as the Clergy are concerned, the doom of pews is sealed; and those partitions originally erected to screen Puritan irreverence from the eye of the law, will no longer disfigure the house, nor distinguish the worshippers of God.

Nor let any false inference be drawn from these remarks as though nothing but selfish motives prevented the Clergy from declaring in favour of free Churches. The mass of the Clergy are on principle opposed to the present system of subdividing the area of our Churches into lots to suit purchasers. But, then they foresee that the small stipends, which they at present receive from pew rents, are likely to become smaller still under the free Church system, unless the principles of the pew holders be changed; and that thus
the evils arising from the pauperism of the Clergy will be greatly increased by greater aversion on the part of young men to enter the Ministry, and by the degradation of the clerical body socially. Pews may be made free, more easily than the occupants made liberal. The Clergy are therefore apprehensive as to the result of a wide-spread change to the free system. They (or at least a large number of them) think that the Church is not prepared for it, or in other words, nor yet sufficiently imbued with Evangelical principles on the subject of giving. They dread a failure of the experiment. They know that should there be a decided want of success in carrying out free churchism, the old system of pews will be riveted tighter than ever on themselves and their children. They are therefore timid as to the result, though the majority have little doubts as to the comparative merit of the two systems, as viewed in the light of scripture or reason.

We therefore reiterate our belief, that if churchmen would perform their duty in giving one-tenth of their means to the cause of God and the Church, there would soon be no repugnance to free Churches, and that new principles in giving would lead to new principles in other things, one of which we suspect would be, the recognition of the right of the poor to “have the Gospel preached to them.” But it may be replied, what is to prevent a man from paying his tithe and yet retaining his pew? The tithe may be regularly paid, and yet pride and exclusiveness combine to perpetuate the appropriation of seats. We think not. When ever such a revolution comes over the Church, as will make her members as liberal as the Jews of old, we shall witness still further progress in the right direction. The heart which is sufficiently enlarged to pay a tenth, because the scripture requires it, will, we imagine, next obey the precept which bids us “preach the gospel to every creature.” The man who at the call of principle checks his covetousness by giving a tenth, will also surrender his pride by resigning his pew. And let it not be forgotten that if the members of the Church were thus liberal, sufficient church room might be provided so as to afford a pew to every episcopalian family in the land—the only consummation which could be pleaded as an apology for not adopting free Churchism.

We fear that some of our remarks may be regarded as too sweeping, or misinterpreted; as though we believed that there is nothing being done in the way of liberality to the Church on true evangeli-
cal principles. We deprecate such false deduction. Thank God, there are in His Church a remnant that have not bowed the knee to Mammon. But, alas! they are but a remnant. The great mass of Christians are not self-denying men. Their offerings lack that incense which can alone recommend them—a self-denying zeal, an effort to imitate the Saviour in his self-sacrificing devotedness. And yet a Jew was commanded by Jehovah to offer thirty per cent. of his income to maintain the priesthood, the Temple and the poor. Is a Christian's obligation less? Are there not the very same virtues to be educated and strengthened under the dispensation of the gospel, as were required to be exercised under the law? It would have been no difficult matter to have apportioned a part of Canaan to the Levites had God so willed it; but this tribe of God's ministering servants was to be supported by the remaining tribes for the express purpose of training them up in the practice of self-denial, and of compelling them to acknowledge and feel that the silver and gold were the Lord's. The belief that they were but the trustees for Jehovah—that it were as great a crime to withhold His tithe as to appropriate the trust money of a neighbour, was thus instumental in keeping up a constant recognition of God's sovereignty and man's dependence. The effect on the Jewish mind intended to be produced by the requirement of tenths and offerings is well expressed by David, when, in the fulness of his joy at the free-will offerings of his people, he exclaimed, "For all things come of thee, and of thine own have we given thee."

Now, where is the assignable reason for not fostering and perpetuating the same high moral feeling in the Christian Church? Why is the standard of self-denial lowered in the Church? Is self-denial one of those carnal ordinances, which were abolished by the Gospel? Or, if it be admitted, that it is still a virtue, immutable in its nature, we ask again is its standard degraded? Under God's special government, a Jew was trained to self-denial and a confession of his dependence upon God by a demand of the tenth of his worldly substance; and can a Christian be perfected in the same grace on easier terms? The funds of God's treasury contributed by Jews were required for the Jewish poor and the Jewish ritual exclusively; and yet a tenth was the minimum donation. Millions of heathens are thrown on the mercy of the Church now; and a tenth is not even an acknowledged obligation. The systematic payment of tithe tests sincerity, and is, to some extent, self-denial to all.
Hence, its unpopularity. Hence, the endeavour to evade it, and to prove its burden no part of the gospel system.

But, setting aside all allusion to tithe, casting away system altogether for the sake of argument, let the Christian Church read, mark, and inwardly digest these words, "If any man will come after ME let him DENY himself." If then a tenth be given, and yet cause no self-denial, a tenth is too little; if a fifth can be spared, without feeling its loss; if it be bestowed and yet no restriction ensue to the vanity or pride of life, then a fifth is not enough. But we forbear; the truths of God cannot be expressed precisely in arithmetical terms, there is, however, one rule which no skill can avade or ingenuity misinterpret, and it is this: "IF ANY MAN WILL COME AFTER ME, LET HIM DENY HIMSELF."

In one respect the Christian priesthood is made to resemble the Levitical. They must have no part nor inheritance among the people. They must refrain from the mart, the office, and the labour of their hands. The Church, more exacting than in primitive times, forbids them to earn their bread by the sweat of their brow. Tent-makers they cannot be. But here the similarity ceases. The value received, or rather expected by Christians, differs from that expected by Jews. In the case of the latter, it consisted in the consciousness of having obeyed the divine law; in the habit of self-denial thus formed; in the constant rememberance of Him "who gave them power to get wealth;" and in the gradual preparation for the resignation of all property at death. And who will contend that similar practice in the Christian Church will not produce similar results? Let a disinterested spectator HONESTLY say, what is in fact the value expected in return for the offerings of too many Christians! Perhaps in giving less, they expect less in return than the Jew. But the value, too often expected, is the comfortable pew, the membership in a fashionable congregation; the eloquent discourse; the name of respectability; the improvement of property; the escape from importunity; the satisfaction of not being outdone; the fascinating ritual; the delightful music; the character for liberality; and the gratification of ostentation. We mean there must be the return expected by the large proportion of donors, BECAUSE their donations are generally limited to that sum which the forgoing motives naturally suggest and account for. If the love of Christ constrained to self-denial, such a spectacle as that of a wealthy congregation in a splendid temple, expending on themselves more than on their
needy and destitute brethren, could not be presented to our view. Did true Christian principle actuate the Church, so many of her members would not be content to live in luxurious ease, while the privations of the Clergy were unrelieved, or the means of grace withheld from a large proportion of the population.
APPENDIX.

SUPPORT YOUR MINISTERS.

On more than one occasion we have drawn attention to the obligation every Christian is under to contribute of his substance to the support of his Minister. It is a duty which no Christian can get rid of, but it is a duty which a great many neglect for want of giving the matter due attention. There is one fact which every congregation should take into account when providing their Minister’s salary, and that is, that the cost of living has increased from 25 to 50 per cent. during the last three or four years. The Minister, therefore, who received £150 a year in 1850, was better off than with £200 in 1857, because the former sum would go as far towards procuring the necessaries of life in 1850 as the latter sum will now.—Bathurst Courier.

The above is too true—the preacher very often experiences sad neglect at the hands of those amongst whom he labours. The scripture tells us “the labourer is worthy of his hire;” and we are certain there is no class of men who work harder than our country Ministers. Can any one tell us who is more grudgingly remunerated, than he who every week speaks to us of God’s mercy and goodness—who travels many miles to our lonely and cheerless school-houses in the most inclement seasons to refresh those gathered therein with “tidings of great joy?” On this matter a want of thought and consideration is generally exhibited which shows too plainly the lack of vital Christianity amongst us. We all profess to believe the Bible, and frequent with more or less regularity the house of God—we listen week after week to the admonitions of the preacher—and yet act towards him as if he had little or no claim upon us. He may toil in our midst for years without a thought on the part of many that he frequently returns at night to a home not by any means supplied as it should be with the comforts of life. Yet in our hour of sickness or mental distress who is called on?—to whom do we
look for aid and assistance in directing us heavenward? To the minister of God! Let us be more mindful of him then; let us fail not to contribute of our means to render his home a cheerful one, and thus strengthen him in the prosecution of his saving mission. There are men amongst us (and we regret that it is so) whose souls are wrapped up in the money they have accumulated—who worship Mammon, and no other God. The attend our Churches and our Meetings—but did the promulgation of the word of God depend upon the contributions of such, we would be as destitute of a preached gospel as the natives of Central Africa. We do not expect our remarks will have much effect upon such men—where the inculcations of scripture have failed through a long series of years of continued health and prosperity, we entertain no hope of making any impression. To the reader who unthinkingly has been neglectful of the acknowledged claims of his spiritual teacher we speak. We ask you to bestir yourself, and gladden the good man’s heart with some substantial demonstration of the extent to which his efforts are appreciated,—show forth your willingness to aid in the propagation of God’s word.—**Merrickville Chronicle.**

---

**MINISTERIAL REMUNERATION.**

1. The work of the ministry is the work of the Church. The Minister is employed by the Church to labour for their good, and to be their overseer and director in all that pertains to their work.

II. Ministers, like other men, are entitled to a fair compensation for the time and capital used in the service of the Church, in proportion to their relative value, and the diligence and skill with which they are applied. “Even so hath the Lord ordained, that they which preach the gospel, shall live of the gospel.”

III. The same considerations which influence us in fixing the rate of compensation for other services, are applicable in the Minister’s case. The expense of living, the social position he is expected to maintain, the education of his children, the means of general intelligence and improvement, and a proper regard to the future for infirmity and age, are all to be regarded the same as in secular employments.
If the people are rightfully increasing their wealth and worldly comforts, they should pay their Minister, so that with the same economy he may have the same advantages, besides complying with all the demands of his social position and his professional usefulness.

IV. If the Minister does not receive a fair compensation for the service rendered, his usefulness is in various ways impaired.

(a) Ministers are yet but men, and are subject to similar conditions with other men. Even the life of true faith does not prevent despondency and forebodings of evil, when compelled to subsist their families on a scanty pittance. This state of mind is not remarkably favourable for study or promotive of mental energy.

(b) A limited salary often limits the means of reading and communion with other minds, which are so essential to the vigorous mental improvement, and the proper instruction of the people.

It is this which so often makes the sermon dull and superficial, and which leads to frequent exchanges, to the use of old sermons, and unpremeditated efforts, and finally to a disunion.

(c) When a Minister has his mind filled with the thoughts of a family in want, and how he shall meet his pecuniary engagements, he is not very well qualified to visit his people with profit, or to minister to their spiritual maladies.

(d) The rusty coat, the impress of poverty, the lack of the ordinary conveniencies and comforts of life, and facilities for labour, and the homely fare, all make the insensible, yet real impression of inferiority upon the minds of the people, and it is not strange that they should assign him the place of a third rate man, and that he should crouch to them servilely “for a piece of bread.”

(e) God withholds his blessing—when his people withhold the divinely appointed means of livelihood from his Ministers.