

use. At any rate it is well to view the whole thing in as charitable a frame of mind as possible, for usually very little positive harm is done by such ill-considered attacks as we have seen during the past week or two.

It may be taken for granted, however, that some of these onslaughts, whether periodically or spasmodically made, are the results of other and more objectionable causes. Hitting at long range, we believe that in the "wild and woolly West" it is not unusual for a less successful paper to attack its more successful rival in order to discredit it in order to reap some financial advantage unfairly. So, when we observe an editor delivering blows right and left at his contemporaries, we may conclude that he violates the approved tenets of journalistic etiquette, for no other reason than that he is sorely in need of money. When an editor becomes inspired with a sense of public duty to the extent of publishing the shortcomings of his neighbor papers and intimating that he has the divine call to step in with his sheet and set matters right, we know that he is appealing to a longsuffering public for more funds, by delivering a back-handed blow at rival concerns. Usually these methods fail. It must not be supposed that we include a paper like the *New York Independent* in the same category as those papers which are driven by stress of circumstances to act an unworthy part in journalism, but it is to be deeply regretted that many untoward blasts such as we are now referring to find their origin in the sources we have described. Criticism so inspired deserves to fail. The newspaper press is a public institution conducted by private individuals for their own benefit. Its breath of life is the esteem in which it is held by the public. It violates public opinion at its peril, and if it does not reach the standard which it ought to reach, the public is to be blamed. The character of the press depends on public opinion, but it is a mistake to suppose that the press itself manufactures the moral sense by which it is judged. We write thus of set purpose, and our purpose is to place the responsibility where it ought to be placed, mainly on the church and then on the public. Taking it for granted, for the moment, that our news papers are below the moral par, what, we ask, is the church doing to raise the standard? Broad-sides from pulpit or religious press will not do it. It is well to point out defects, but it is better to remove the taste for vicious publications which possesses the public mind as is evident from the demand for poisonous literature. It is no use scolding the press and bringing it into discredit. Indeed the opposite result is usually accomplished in that way, for if a bad sheet is advertised by denunciation, such is the perversity of human nature that that very sheet is sought after more than ever.

We repeat that many of the attacks on news papers are insincere or unwise and generally useless. And the pity is that the church, having witnessed the diatribes sits down contentedly believing she has well done her duty. Her duty, we conceive to be of a very different character.

To begin with the facts of the case ought to be thoroughly searched. They would reveal a condition of things to be very thankful for. They would prove that no newspapers in the English speaking world are as clean and as sympathetic with respect to the Church and its work as the secular press of Canada. Only a few weeks ago a leading Scotch newspaper in a Monday issue, published with considerable detail the reports of seven divorce cases which were tried in the Edinburgh Court of Session on the previous Saturday. There was not one line in that issue about the church services of the Sunday (the day before publication). A paragraph five lines in length told of the resignation of a minister and half a column leader was devoted to the ridiculing

of the Dingwall Presbytery because of a warm debater in which brethren said uncomplimentary things of each other. We venture to say that no Canadian journal of standing would have ventured on the same treatment of the brethren and it is not their practice to ignore moral and christian work as is done in Great Britain and in the United States. It is the duty of the Church to know these things well and to show its appreciation of them, by encouraging, not excoriating the Canadian press on every convenient occasion. But how does the Church encourage a clean press? Not by a friendly attitude towards it, for we are aware that reporters and editors are tolerated rather than welcomed by some of the responsible officers and ministers of the church. In many cases the newspapers are obliged to gather Church news from irresponsible or hostile sources because the proper officers are neither considerate nor condescending. There are of course notable exceptions, or it would have been worse for the church ere now. Then the managers look upon their business with the press from a purely business standpoint. Advertisements are sometimes kept back, for various reasons, from columns that are seldom defiled by sensational reports, and placed in papers whose policy is not governed by any moral consideration. And further, the Christian public and the church neglect to take advantage of the Secular press for the furthering of their cherished objects.

We believe that very few newspaper proprietors in Canada would refuse to concede all the churches could reasonably expect in the direction of a higher standard of journalism, if they but believed that the Christian public would stand by them in the consequences such a concession would assuredly involve. We are not aware that steps have ever been taken by the Churches to obtain such a concession, and until something in this direction has been done, the Churches will be neglecting their clear duty. Sound Christian sentiment lies at the root of newspaper as well as of every reform worth the name. When we forget this truth, we may fly to editorial denunciation of the press, but the evil will not be so remedied.

#### A VETERAN'S DEATH.

A tribute will be lovingly laid on the grave of the late Rev. David Waters, D.D., LL.D., by our readers. Gathered to his fathers at the end of the allotted span, he was "full of years," and on his venerable brow the laurel of service was fresh and fragrant. That service had been rendered in many spheres and in several communities. But although the sphere was often changed, his work remained, a sweet memory, wherever his lot had been cast. He was a lovable man, a kind pastor, and an energetic, able worker in the wide range of his duties. His outlook on life was broad; his views and aims positive and definite and the secret spring of action was an unswerving belief in the cardinal doctrines of his Church. He was well-known in Ontario, having studied at Toronto University and Knox College, and having afterwards ministered as pastor at Southampton, Port Hope and St. Mary's, Ontario, four centres of influence and importance. In these places he found and left devoted congregations and the twelve years devoted to the Ontario field gave color to his lifework. In 1873 he accepted a call to St. David's church, St. John, N.B., in which city he labored successfully until his acceptance in 1883 of a call to the North Reformed church, New Jersey, where he continued his ministry until 1891, when ill-health compelled his retirement from pastoral work. He served his day and generation well, and has left an example behind him worthy of being followed.