

from the ranks by their energy, perseverance and genius. In politics, it must be independent, giving support to all measures for the good of the country from whatever side they came. It should have an honest, straight forward, Church of England tone, and its leading articles should not all be ever harping upon church matters. If they did, the paper would never touch the fringe of the great multitude for whom he designed it. They should therefore deal especially with the great social questions of the day; and above all things, they should keep clear of the "goody" style. Correspondence should be encouraged, and extracts given from articles in the principal dailies. Lastly, he particularly urged that it should be conducted on principles of common sense.

The Editor of *Our Own Fireside and Hand and Heart*, Rev. C. Bullock, thought there were serious difficulties in the way of establishing a daily organ for the Church. As a secular paper, it would have formidable rivals; and it would have to eschew party in an ecclesiastical sense. Another difficulty would exist, about funds. The *Hour* cost its proprietors £70,000, and failed after all. He recommended utilising the existing press. He had lately noticed a tendency to introduce, in a local newspaper, attractive literary features, social, scientific, sanitary, amusing; and he was persuaded that a column judiciously selected and voluntarily contributed would be regarded as helpful aid by many provincial editors. The humanity question, temperance, and other movements might be introduced; and above all, the sunny side of religion might be introduced and its essential truths commended. The Church paper should be the pulpit in the home, but not written in the pulpit style.

The press was defended by Mr. Gilbert Venables from the harsh language sometimes bestowed upon it. He blamed others, however, who were not successful in their efforts to utilize it. In illustration of this point, he suggested a case, as follows: On a given day in a given town, let there be two grand functions, one Roman Catholic, and one Church of England. Accounts of both are sent to the same paper, and only the Roman Catholic appears; so that the disappointed parish parson imagines the editor is in "the pay of Rome." But what is the reason? It is this: On the evening of the given day, the sub-editor of the paper, on coming to his desk, will find some such telegram as this from the Roman Catholic official told off for the purpose—"Expect seventy-five words from me to-night about the opening of St. Winifred's here; Archbishop Manning preaches." In due time the wire brings the seventy-five words arranged so as to tell everything, and to give the sub-editor not one moment's trouble. The whole business has cost the senders two shillings, and the paper has a good paragraph of news for nothing. Some time the next day our own Clergyman, remembering how successful was the laying of the foundation stone of his new church the day before, is impressed with the idea of sending an account to

the papers. The organist or schoolmaster is commissioned to write it. Full of the importance of the duty and the event, he elaborates a composition, which would fill a quarter of a column, mentions everybody's name, and puffs his friends. Posted that day, it arrives in the sub-editor's hands as he is making up the paper for the next day, four days after the event. He looks at it, struggles with it, cuts out superfluities, wastes perhaps three minutes over it, and when he comes to the puffs, pitches it into the waste paper basket with an exclamation of disgust. Mr. Venables said he took a Roman Catholic case, because in these matters the Roman Catholics make fewer mistakes and lose fewer opportunities than any people he knew; although what is true of them is also true of many others. They take care that nothing they do shall remain hidden, and they take pains to find out how it may best be put into the hands of journalists with a view to publication. They know the value of time; and above all, they have some idea of the relative importance of events from the journalistic standpoint, and can tell what would be thought worth a hundred lines, and what must be kept for twenty-five. Mr. Venables also recommended that a damaging mis-statement or misrepresentation should never go uncontradicted. It should be contradicted without imputing malice, without heat, without showing contempt of ignorance, humorously if possible, but certainly in few words. In illustration of the way in which he thought the clergy should utilize the press he said that—some years ago, in a midland county, there was started a county paper, whose principles bid fair to be everything that, from the Church point of view, was dangerous and abominable. The clergy and their friends were distressed and alarmed; but one of them, who was in charge of the parish where the publication first saw the light, took a different view. He subscribed. He sent a letter on some topic of interest, and it was gladly inserted; he sent leaders on various subjects, and they were adopted—for these new enterprises have to be economical. In short he quietly became the controlling spirit of that paper till the time when, many years afterwards, regretted by all orthodox churchmen, it ceased to be published. Mr. Venables said the story in question was no fable, for the clergyman was his own father.

In the course of the discussion which was continued for the usual period, the Rev. W. J. Knox Little, thought the press was becoming a vast despotism from the practice of anonymous writing. He thought the *Guardian* did a great work because it contained such a mass of information. He confessed he had something of a liking for that "Penn'orth of spite," the *Church Times*; first because it was so very clever; secondly, because it was really so very outspoken; and thirdly, because it did not deal with that kind of clap-trap into which religious papers were so likely to be led. He thought that with its cleverness, if

it partook of a little more charity towards persons, not towards special opinions, it would be a useful organ. If its tone were only more elevated, it would be excellent. On the other hand, there was a paper, the *Rock*, which all would agree might be improved in its tone. He concluded by advising not to be too hard with the daily press, endeavoring to discountenance that part of it which was simply worldly, and supporting that which was true and real.

Canon Erskine Clarke calculated that the Sunday papers had a circulation of 1,300,000, with perhaps six or seven millions of readers. He thought there was a disagreeable unreality in denouncing people for reading on the Sunday about the topics of the day, when we ourselves freely talk about them, and often take a pride in introducing them into our sermons, and thought something might be done in supplying a paper which may be read on a Sunday.

The general impression at the Congress seemed to be that the post of editor to the Utopian paper, the character of which had been sketched out by Mr. Godfrey Thring, would be very undesirable. The English custom of anonymous writing was also defended; and the clergy were recommended to send their paragraphs to Liberal and Conservative organs alike.

MR. STANLEY IN AFRICA.

This remarkable traveller has been called a "pioneer of civilization;" but the Aborigines' Protection Society and the Anti-Slavery Society appear to demur somewhat to the correctness of this appellation, and to think the said explorer may be doing as much harm as good in the land he has undertaken to discover. It would appear from his own statements, written on the spot, that in making his way among the population there, he has been unnecessarily and therefore unwarrantably shooting down the natives, just merely to give an idea of what he can do in case they were to attack him. This is too much like the plan which has often been pursued by the "pioneers of civilization" in the South Seas; and hence the murder by the natives, of some of our best and most valued men. The two above mentioned Societies have addressed a memorial to Lord Derby on the subject, whose official answer states that: "His Lordship has read with great regret reports of the circumstances which seem to have taken place in connection with Mr. Stanley's exploration, and which have created such a painful impression in the country." His Lordship cannot but hope, looking to the character which Mr. Stanley has won in this country by his expedition in search of Dr. Livingstone, that he may eventually be able to afford some explanation or justification of his proceedings, which is not apparent from the reports which have been as yet received. Mr. Stanley not being a British subject, of course the British Government can have no authority over him. In reference to the Foreign Secretary's charitable hope, it is remarked that the