

Is your Minister Paid?

My dear reader, is your minister paid? You have a minister. You value your soul too highly to let its concerns be neglected, and you know well the importance of gospel institutions in their relation to both the temporal and eternal interests of man. For your own sake, for the sake of your family, and for the sake of the public good, you would not for anything be without a minister.

Is your minister paid? He should be. He earns his money. He spent much in getting an education, and qualifying himself to serve you well. And he labors hard. Could you spend a single week with him, witness his cares, and toils and anxieties; could you look into his mind, and see all his mental labors and conflicts; and could you know how often he retires with a burdened heart and a weary head to a restless pillow, you would confess that no man better earns his money. Is he paid? Adequately and promptly paid?

Is your minister paid? He should be. It is but a justice. He earns his dues. He has a right to them. You would not keep back your laborer's wages; and will you deal more unjustly with the one who labors for your soul? James v. 4. It is not charity he asks; he is not a beggar; justice demands for him a fair, and full, and prompt compensation. Is he paid?

Is your minister paid? He should be. His family may suffer if he is not paid, for he may not be able to procure for them what they need. Provision and clothing cannot be had without money. He is a man, and he must eat and drink, and live as other men do; and so must his family. Even if his family may not suffer, yet he himself may suffer much mentally, because not able to meet his bills as they become due. If you have any regard for his feelings, and for the wants and feelings of his family, you should pay your minister promptly. Is he paid?

Is your minister paid? He should be. His reputation is at stake. He ought not to be in debt. Especially ought he not to fail in paying all he owes as soon as it is due. But how can he pay, if he is not paid? And how can he maintain his credit? How shield his reputation? In this regard his reputation is in your hands, and you should protect it and to this end you should pay him. Is he paid?

Is your minister paid? He should be. His usefulness depends upon it. If he is not paid, how can he give to the poor, and to missionary and other benevolent efforts? How can he labor when oppressed with care, or harassed with debt, or in constant anxiety and perplexity as to the wants of his family? And how can he do good when his own reputation suffers because his engagements are not properly met? Reader, if you would help your minister to be useful, you must pay him. Is he paid? Reader, is he paid?

Is your minister paid? Paid! Do you say this is a worldly view of the subject? Very true; but ministers live in the world as well as you; and how can they live without a living? And how can they labor without it? And how can your minister live, if you do not pay him? Is he paid?

Is your minister paid? Paid! Do you say, All but a little! But many little make much; and these very little may be just what your minister at this moment needs. If he is not paid; and if the last cent of every subscription or pew rent is not collected or paid over to him, he is not paid; and reader, do not rest to-night till you can say, My minister is paid! Not only pay your own subscription or pew rent, but see that all others pay theirs; for in this matter no one is free till all are free; the minister is not paid till the whole amount due him is paid. This is what justice requires; this is what the gospel enjoins; this is what the people have engaged to do; this is what he has a right to expect; and when all that is due him is paid, then, and not till then, the minister is paid. Reader, is your minister paid? Is he paid?

For the Christian Messenger.

"In the morning sow thy seed, and in the evening withhold not thy hand: for thou knowest not whether shall prosper, either this or that, or whether they both shall be alike good."—Eccles. xi. 16.

In the Spring of 1862, the minds of God's people in Chester were moved to hold special services, in the different sections of the church, having in view the advancement of religion among themselves and the conversion of precious souls. In the Windsor road section there seemed to be an unusual awakening. A number were hopefully converted and some of them were baptized and added to the church.

Among those who attended the meetings was a young female, Mary Marriott by name, who came and went apparently unimpressed. She was of a delicate constitution, and disease had already fastened upon her frame, blighting the rose of health and marking her for an early tomb. Being naturally reserved, no one—not even her friends at home—knew the extent of her exercises of mind.

In the autumn she was taken dangerously ill. Medical aid was sought but to little or no purpose. I was called to visit her, and as she had never professed religion, I expected to find her in a state of alarm in view of approaching death. But to my surprise I found her calmly awaiting the summons, and confidently resting on Christ her Redeemer whom she had found to be precious. On further enquiry she informed

me that during those meetings in the early spring her mind was deeply impressed with the importance of religion. She was led to seek the Saviour, and found peace in the exercise of faith in His pardoning love. It was in one of the prayer meetings that light dawned upon her soul, and that hope sprung up which proved in the hour of death "as an anchor of the soul both sure and steadfast." She saw the path of duty but was unable to take up the cross and obey the Saviour's command. On the sick bed, however, she resolved that if health and strength were sufficiently restored, she would follow her Lord in baptism. This privilege was not granted her. She passed away the 20th Feb., 1863, aged 22 years, leaving with her friends a comfortable evidence that she had gone "to be with Christ which is far better," than to remain in this world of sin.

The above incident affords encouragement for Christians to labour in the use of the means of grace, believing that God will accomplish his own purposes in connection therewith. "Let us not be weary in well doing, for in due season we shall reap if we faint not." I. J. S.

Chester, March 2nd, 1863.

For the Christian Messenger.

Our Influence.

Upon the mind and heart of every acquaintance, we make an impression of our character. Or in other words; we paint an image, or likeness of ourselves upon the durable canvass of the memory of our associates.

This representation of ourselves, may be true, or it may be false in various degrees. Some may think us to be just what we are, and take us for our true value. Some may think us very many degrees worse than we are, ay, they may even give us the lowest place in their opinion, when we are very far from deserving it. Others, may even think us very much better than we are; and may even give us the highest place in their esteem, when we do not merit it.

It must be exceedingly painful to the true man, to feel that his fellows think him much worse than he really is; for thereby his influence and usefulness, are most fatally destroyed. And it must be equally painful to the conscientious man, to know that men think him a great deal better than he is, since this is likely to be the result of hypocrisy on his part. It is therefore very desirable, that we so conduct ourselves, that men may think us to be just what we are. But how important that this impression, while it is true, be as perfect, and Christlike as possible.

This is our influence upon the world. Who may calculate its extent. This is the irrevocable voice which speaks, not only while we live, but when we are in our graves. This is our life, either for God or against him. O then touch, with an honest, careful, prayerful hand, every blank which life presents. J. H. L.

Acadia College, Feb. 28th, 1863.

For the Christian Messenger.

Our Prayer-meetings.

MR. EDITOR,—

It is a practice in some of our social prayer-meetings, for those attending to sit or stand during the time of prayer, unless it be those who engage audibly in the exercise. Some of these, too, pray standing. Now I ask is such a course proper?

True, God looks more at the heart, than upon the position of the body, therefore so far as the prayer is concerned, it probably matters not, for

"Prayer is the soul's sincere desire,
Unuttered or expressed."

Does not, however, the sacred volume enjoin upon Christians to bow the knee in prayer. In Psalm xcv. 6, David says, "O come, let us worship and bow down: let us kneel before the Lord our Maker." Is it not the most humble posture the body can be placed in? Surely if men will humble themselves to bow to an earthly prince, when presenting a petition, how much more should they to Our Heavenly King. When gathered around the family altar, or communing with God in secret, this posture is invariably adopted as most fitting; and should not Christians humble themselves, sufficiently to bend the knee when their fellow Christians offer prayer?

The most important thing is to have the heart right with God, and to offer spiritual worship, but still in my humble opinion the posture of the body should not be wholly overlooked.

Yours, &c., OLD STYLE.

Bridgewater, Dec. 1862.

Provincial Parliament.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

We have not, thus far during the session, given any account of the doings in this branch of the Legislature, as public attention has been directed more to proceedings in the House of Assembly.

The absence of debates however enables the reporter for the Legislative Council, to give, in the reports of that body, abstracts of public documents, of much interest. We have taken some items of information in our Parliamentary summaries from this source, and now proceed to lay before our readers some others, for which we are indebted to the labors of that gentleman.

MONDAY, Feb. 23rd.

NOVA SCOTIA GOLD FIELDS.

Hon. Sol. General, by command, laid before the House the report of the Chief Gold Commissioner, dated 23rd Jan. 1863.

The Commissioner states that the accounts of the receipts and expenditures in connection with the gold fields, during the year, show that the amount received for rent was \$29,469.51 And the expenditure was 25,631.70

Leaving a balance to the credit of the mines of	3,837.81
The salary of the Chief Commissioner was paid by the Rec'r. General, which, up to the 31st Dec. was	1,416.00

This deducted from the above balance reduces the nett proceeds to \$2,421.81

The receipts from the 1st Jan. to the 30th April were paid to the Commissioner of Crown Lands, and amounted to \$11,972.25, and the disbursements made by him during the same period amounted to \$6,601.59. The Commissioner remarks that it should be borne in mind, however, that the greater portion of instalments, paid as a quarter's rent in 1861, were made by the law to cover the entire rent for a year, and a large proportion of the disbursements made by the Commissioner of Crown Lands in 1862 was for services performed in 1861. The Gold Commissioner further remarks that at the close of 1862 nearly all the accounts against the Department were settled and paid. The amount paid proprietors of land last year was \$9,166.52, and the construction of roads cost \$4,840.15. The commissioner states that these two services can, under no conceivable circumstances, bear so heavily upon the revenue this year, as in the past. It appears that no royalty has been collected, it not being demandable until the expiration of a year from the date of the leases, and, consequently, the whole revenue received has been in the shape of rent. The commissioner recommends the abolition of the rent, and the collection of the royalty alone. It seems that the average yield of quartz obtained from the ordinary leads was 1 oz. 17 dwts. 7 grs. per ton. It would appear that the mines at Tangier, Wine Harbor, Sherbrooke, Isaac's Harbor, Oldham and Renfrew yielded during the quarter ending 31st Dec., 1862, as nett proceeds to the miners (who numbered 484), \$44,531, or an average of \$1.18 per day to each man. In Victoria (Australia), in 1860, the quartz mines yielded only 31 cts. per day per miner—the number of miners being 18,296, and the whole produce of the quartz mines for the year, 93,025 oz., 2 dwts. The total quantity of gold reported as the produce of the Nova Scotia gold fields for the past year, is 7,110 ounces. It appears that there are now in operation 30 crushing mills, which are estimated to have cost \$107,100. The following applications were made in 1862 for free mining leases, on account of discovery of gold in the counties named: in Halifax 14, Hants 9, Guysboro 6, Lunenburg 4, Colchester 4, Kings 3, Pictou 3, Yarmouth 2, Sydney 1, Richmond 1—in all 47.

A PROHIBITORY LIQUOR LAW IN THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.
No liquor to be sold or given away at elections.

Hon. Sol. General presented a bill to secure the freedom and more orderly conducting at elections. The hon. gentleman introduced the bill with a few prefatory remarks, and observed that it suspended, during nomination and election days, all tavern and shop licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquors, and also prohibited the selling, giving or disposing of such liquors on such days, by any person, except to members of his own family, under the penalty of \$100, to be recovered before any two Justices of the Peace. He thought that the bill would tend to remedy the evils which all deplored now attendant on elections, and would also lessen the expenses of candidates,—at all events, he believed it to be a step in the right direction.

Hon. Mr. Dickey congratulated the hon. gentleman on having become a convert to the doctrine he (Mr. D.) had propounded in this house some time since. When he (Mr. D.) presented a bill to secure not only the freedom but the purity of elections, he was told by the hon. gentleman that it was to a certain extent out of place to legislate on such subjects here. If the bill just presented would remedy an admitted evil, he (Mr. D.) would support it, notwithstanding the objection so powerfully urged by the hon. gentleman on a former occasion. He thought, however, that the bill would increase rather than lessen candidates' expenses, if it shut up public houses.

Hon. Sol'r. General.—It shuts up other houses, too.

Hon. Mr. Dickey.—Shuts up other houses! The hon. gentleman, as a constitutional lawyer, knows the difficulty there would be in entering private houses to stop drinking. Experience unfortunately proves that at elections people will have liquor, and if they do not get it at one place they will at another.

I fear that the bill, instead of decreasing the evil, will rather increase it.

After some further discussion in which Hon. Sol. General and Hon. Mr. Archibald took part, he bill was read a first time, and, on motion of Hon. Sol. General, ordered to be printed.

This bill was again taken up on the 27th. We give the debate as officially reported.

Hon. Solicitor General, with a few brief remarks, moved the second reading of his bill to ensure the purity and more orderly conducting of elections.

Hon. Mr. Holmes rose to suggest to the hon. introducer of the bill that his measure proposed to remedy only one of the evils attendant at elections. There were other evils incident to such contests. At one election on nomination day, a certain gentleman from Halifax proclaimed that certain discoveries had been made which would prevent the further carrying on of the railway; or, at all events, that the surplus revenue of the country was largely reduced by extravagant and illegal subsidies to railway contractors. Suppose that this had been done by a Solicitor General or by a member of the Executive, or by a member of the Legislative Chamber, or by the chairman of the Railway Board, or by the whole Railway Board, or by the whole four rolled into one.

Hon. Mr. Dickey observed that there were other causes of excitement at elections, beside liquor. Some of the most excitable people on such occasions were those who did not taste liquor. Elections in this country were conducted in as orderly a manner as in any other country. It was constitutionally wrong to enter private houses and say to the inmates, you shall not give your friend a glass of wine. The House should avoid legislating against private rights, and, on this principle, he objected to the bill.

Hon. Mr. Whitman was inclined to think that after all there was more good than evil in the bill, even if it did entirely prevent the use of liquors for 2 days out of the 365. He trusted that we had seen the worst of our railroad affairs. The worst days of rum influence had passed away, still the bill was necessary, and he would support it.

Hon. Mr. Almon observed that men were often brought to the poll so disguised with liquor, that he names of the people for whom they were to vote had to be put into their mouths. He was aware that the bill could not remedy this evil altogether, but it might in part, and he would therefore support it.

Hon. Mr. Pineo had seen a great deal of drunkenness at elections, both on nomination and election days, and he should be glad indeed if the bill could prevent it. He believed that the bill would do a little good, though not half the good the hon. introducer expected.—The stringent clause which had been alluded to might be very easily got over. If a man did not choose to give a glass of wine to his friend, he might, if he had it in his house, tell him where to find it.

Hon. Sol. Gen'l. did not regret the remarks of the hon. member from Pictou (Hon. Mr. Holmes), though they were entirely uncalled for in this debate, as they gave him an opportunity of refuting an oft-repeated calumny. He (Sol. Gen.) supposed that the hon. gentleman wished to call his attention to the remarks recently made by an hon. gentleman in the other branch. He (Sol. Gen.) had been in this house fifteen years, and he had never before referred to anything said in the other branch. He would now state very succinctly what was said by him at Truro at the last general election. In the journals for 1861, appendix No. 51, page 12, were to be found in tabular form the facts substantially as enunciated by him at Truro. The railway extras paid out amounted to £109,487 3s. 3d., and the whole amount of the contracts on which our railways were built was only £446,029 9s. 4d. That was the fact he had enunciated at Truro, and he now enunciated it again. £74,791 3s. 4d. were paid out under the certificates of Mr. Laurie, and £34,695 19s. 11d. under those of Mr. Forman. He thanked the hon. gentleman from Clare (Hon. Mr. Comeau) for having put him in a position to make this statement, by asking for these returns at a time when Providence kept him (Sol. Gen.) from the house, and prevented his making use of them.

Hon. Mr. Holmes could assure the hon. gentleman who had just sat down that he had no intention of imitating his feelings. A friend of his own had said that his (Sol. Gen.) statements at Truro were "largely inaccurate."

Hon. Sol. Gen'l.—I say that they were not.

Hon. Mr. Brown would not put it to hon. members generally, but he would put it to the hon. Sol. Gen'l. himself, if his remarks had not a tendency to deceive the House. Were not the extras included in the contracts themselves? The hon. Sol. Gen'l. says the late Government paid those extras. They acted on principles recommended by committees appointed by the Legislature for that purpose—by committees selected, on one occasion at all events from both sides of the House.

Hon. Solicitor General did not understand the hon. gentleman. If he meant that the contracts contained the usual clause that if any more work was required to be done, it was to be done at contract prices, he (Sol. Gen.) admitted it.

Hon. Mr. Brown was about to proceed, when he was interrupted by the Hon. Pr. sident, who remarked that a debate on railway affairs was irrelevant.