

we can see much to justify it. The public service only takes a part of his time ; he is usually a man of private resources ; his public duties allow him still to carry on his own business or profession ; and there are rewards in public life which may ultimately make it worth his while to enter upon it, apart from higher motives. But when any one enters into the public service permanently, giving his whole time to it, and that service requires ability, education, and character,—as in the case of departmental officers, judges, and other stipendiaries of the courts, revenue collectors, &c., &c.—the “indemnity” principle is laid aside, and that of “compensation” adopted. The same rule is followed by all commercial houses. How do these examples bear on the question before us ? Here we have an order of men who give their whole time to serving the public, who have no other business, who rarely possess private fortunes, and who can look for no “prizes” in their professional career ? Why should they not have “compensation,” instead of “indemnity ?”

From the minister’s point of view, there may be some consolation derived from the “indemnity” idea. It relieves him of the sense of degradation he might feel, were it understood that he accepted a very small stipend as a fair equivalent for his services. Many a self-denying spirit will content itself with daily bread for Christ’s sake, that would scorn such a recompense if offered as a matter of business.

But from the people’s point of view, this arrangement does not look so well, save only when absolute poverty compels them to offer a mere “indemnity.” But when they are able to do more, and ask an able, hard-working man, who, in commercial or professional life, could make an ample income and lay by a competent fortune against old age, to take the wages of a journeyman mechanic, or the salary of a clerk,—and think him “greedy of filthy lucre” if he is not content,—“there’s something rotten in the state of Denmark.” We do not plead for drones in the hive, for incompetent or indolent men ;—they have no business in the ministry at all ; to receive either “compensation” or “indemnity ;”—but for those who are admitted to “rule well,” “to labour in word and doctrine,” and so to be “worthy of double honour.” We commend it to all concerned to ask, whether this whole matter does not require to be put upon a new footing, in justice to the ministry of the present, and to avert an utter failure of any ministry for the future.

---



---

#### DR. SCADDING ON BISHOP STRACHAN.

We do not know when we have read a more interesting quarter-dollar’s worth of Canadian literature, than we have found in “*The First Bishop of Toronto, a Review and a Study*, by Henry Scadding, D.D.” The author is a scholar and a gentleman, a High Churchman withal ; and his fine culture, historic research, and large Christian intelligence adorn every page. The tone of the pamphlet is singularly dispassionate. Here and there a gleam of emotion shines forth ; but, for the most part, the writer seems to look on his subject with most philosophical disinterestedness. Dr. Scadding was succes-