

year require \$1,000 more than the subscriptions, with a decreasing sum as the paper rose in circulation—that is, supposing that it did so. For the present, I expect that the issue will have to remain as it is; but I am sure I speak the mind of the editor when I say that he will gladly receive any suggestions as to improvement, and adopt them so far as possible, and that when the Publishing Company, whose property THE INDEPENDENT is, shall have another man for the post, he is ready to vacate it with all its honours and emoluments.

Since the above was written I have received from one of the ministers who was at the conference a letter on the matter of THE INDEPENDENT, conceived in an excellent spirit, and containing some practical suggestions as to changes, etc. These suggestions will, I am sure, receive full consideration from the directors of the Publishing Company. In the meantime I thank the writer publicly, as I have done privately, for his letter. A quiet half-hour's talk among friends would be far more helpful than a morning's speech-making denunciations.

HENRY J. CLARK.

[To the above we add a very few words. THE INDEPENDENT is supposed to be printed in the interests of a Christian constituency. Some manifestations of this Christianity we fail to appreciate; e.g., a brother writes a letter—not to THE CANADIAN INDEPENDENT, but to the editor personally. From this letter items of news are culled, and put in our columns. The opinions expressed we assume to be personal, and therefore do not print them. The brother complains, not to ourselves, as common courtesy would suggest, but to another brother, who keeps the secret until the complaint is launched forth in what is virtually a public meeting. We confess to a lack of appreciation of such brotherly attention. Again, we do not expect to please everybody, but we have “a clear and quiet conscience,” and there we rest. We expect grumbling, we welcome brotherly counsel, we invite help, and we have unbounded trust in the great God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom we humbly dedicate the talent we have, and by whose aid we seek to discharge the duties that have been placed upon us in the editor's chair. We thank the many friends who have helped us by word and deed, and feel that if all would do as they, we should have an INDEPENDENT not one whit behind the best paper in the Dominion.—Ed.]

IS THAT THE BEST WORK YOU CAN DO?

The other week, a straight-laced denominational journal across the lines advised its readers not to support non-denominational religious papers. One of the non-denominational papers immediately arose, and solemnly asked its denominational neighbour this important question:

IS THAT THE BEST WORK YOU CAN DO FOR THE LORD?

This question is a searcher. It might do most of us a great deal of good if we could hear a voice saying to us at times: Is that the best work *you* can do for the Lord?

BROTHER LEGALITY has a weakness for raising legal points in ecclesiastical procedure. It pleases him more to find a legal flaw in something than it pleases him to have a good prayer meeting, or a fine missionary meeting, or even a profitable communion season. When he goes to Presbytery he rises and asks if this meeting has been legally called; then he makes verbal criticism on something in the minutes; then he objects to something as “incompetent,” to another thing as unconstitutional, and crowns his pettifogging performance by declaring something *ultra vires*. Brother, is that the best work you can do for the Lord in a spiritual court? If it is, your first duty is to go home, and get yourself reconstructed.

BROTHER FECKLESS, M.A., stands up in his pulpit, and reads from his manuscript, or from his memory, a dainty little essay, which, by an extraordinary flight of the imagination, he dignifies with the name of sermon. It is written from beginning to end in the third person. It is impersonal all the way through. There is no direct address. He never looks the people squarely in the face, and says “we” or “you.” Hard-headed business men look on with mingled feelings of pity and contempt, as they think of the rousing political address they heard last evening, and remember the way they saw some lawyer work up a jury a few days ago. Brother Feckless, is that the best pulpit work you can do for the Lord?

ELDER OPPOSER does exactly what his name indicates, and does nothing more except serve the communion table. It would be better if he didn't even do that. He never calls on anybody, never visits the sick, never helps in any way. When any new mode of working is proposed then he always comes out strong. His *forte* is to oppose everything—to stand in the way. He is a chronic obstructionist. He neither works himself, nor allows anybody else to work in peace. His motto is, “I object.” His work is to prevent other people from working. Oh, Mr. Opposer, is that the best work you can do for the Lord? If that is the best you can do, how can you expect the welcome, “Well done, thou good and faithful servant”?