

Precedents are oftener formed on quite a new basis—"new departures."

CANADIANS ABROAD often give a remarkably "good account" of themselves; in fact, they have a reputation for "getting up the ladder" of business prosperity—with a character for integrity and solidity, if not wealth. Such was the case of one George Roe who recently died in New York under treatment. Though scarcely turned 40, he had amassed his "million"—not without a romantic series of reverses, almost amounting to apparent "fatality," over which his promptitude, perseverance and "pluck" finally triumphed. He was one of many brothers, all prospering, born at Three Rivers, but best known at Woodbridge, where they were rivals of Hon. Clark Wallace in country grocery business. Another brother married the elder daughter of the late Chief Justice Harrison, Dr. Fred. A. Roe, now retired at "Englefield," near London, England.

THE "CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY," lately formed in England, deserves more than a passing notice; it fills that long-felt want—something strong and solid to counteract the insidious pro-Roman mis-statements which disfigure the public press so that ordinary newspapers can scarcely be admitted as proper reading in Church families. The "personnel" of this English Society—numbering some of the most eminent Bishops and clergy—gives all necessary guarantee for the correctness of whatever statements they decide to publish. It were well if we had something of the sort in Canada; meantime we can make use of the labours and efforts of the English Society.

THE CHURCH AND THE PRESS.

The Pulpit, the Platform and the Press are three great factors in modern life. The last is the most powerful of the three. It is ubiquitous, irresponsible, and it is managed with most splendid ability. It has enormous resources of men and money. It rules Parliament; it is supposed to educate and guide public opinion, to create "cries," to formulate political platforms, to make or to mar personal reputations, and to take a "bird's-eye view" of the whole world. Peoples, Parliaments, Princes, Prelates and Popes feel its power, and, perhaps, fear it. Few things can survive its scorn. With its support fools may rule a kingdom, and rogues exploit the wealth of the richest community. What is the relation of the Church to this grave and great factor in present-day life? That, surely, is a question well worth considering, and, if possible, answering. There are two or three facts which we venture to set before our readers.

Churchmen have never, as yet, fully realized what a power the Press is in modern life. They are just awakening to that fact. Dissent and Rome have been alive to it for a generation or more, and have used it, both openly and secretly, for their own purposes. The Church (both clergy and laity) has been far behind in this matter. The result has been harmful. Church papers have never obtained the support from Churchmen that they deserve, while the press in general has been ignored and allowed to go on very feebly supporting Church policies, or utterly misrepresenting her doctrine, practice and work. To a very large extent the Press of England, outside purely Church journals, is antagonistic or indifferent to the Church. This is largely the fault of Churchmen. The Press lives by getting interesting and up-to-date news; by producing apt and smart articles, and by getting early and

original information in regard to the political, social and religious life of the day. The Non-conformists keep the London and provincial papers well supplied with all this sort of "copy"; and the Romans are even more alert. But Churchmen, either through want of interest in the work of the Church, or through a deep indifference to the life of the common people, let all this pass. What is the result? Dissent, although comparatively a small force in the national life, looms large; while Romanism, less than Dissent, and a decreasing power, manages to play a big part before the public. The great and splendid story of the Church's life and work is left untold; and the English people, by thousands, live and die in the profoundest ignorance of the grandest fact in our national history and life—the Church. Now, surely, there is some more excellent way than this? It is a grave fault of omission, amounting almost to a sin. The Church is God's heritage, left to His servants to keep and defend. It is God's greatest gift to the English nation, and it is a primary duty of Churchmen to guard and perpetuate it. We are asked to resist the attempts to disendow the Church. We do right to resist. But there is a possible endowment which will do much to prevent disendowment of the Church, to win over large bodies of Englishmen to her support, and to add greatly to her legitimate influence amongst the people. And that is the Press rightly used by the Church. No one can imagine that the revival of past customs, or the restoration of beautiful Catholic uses in the service of the Church, will, alone, suffice for this nineteenth century. There is a service for the Church that can only be accomplished when Churchmen take their right place in the public journals of the day.

Churchmen have all the intellectual, literary, political, and social resources needed for a right use of the Press. The vast majority of the educated and leisured classes are Churchmen. Hundreds of clergy have not only the scholarship and ability required by a writer of the Press, but they have the leisure also. Why do they not use both in good sound Press work? What are hundreds of University men doing with themselves? We have the men, the scholars, the cultured classes, with books and time at their command, and yet the Church suffers daily because her sons will not take the trouble to use that which makes public opinion, and masters Parliament, in the interests of the Church, of morality, of Christian life, and the Faith. The intellectual idleness of thousands of Churchmen and their ecclesiastical indifference is a grave scandal and ought to be removed. The clergy are, we fear, somewhat to blame for this. They are too often men of a past age. They ought to be the leaders of the present time, stimulating their congregations to thought, to definite reading, to scientific research, to the study of history, politics, and the grave problems that are pressing upon us on all hands. In the matter of worship we have seen a great revival. More and more the Holy Eucharist is becoming the centre of our faith and worship. But, let it be remembered that faith and worship have to make life, and that no life can be what a Churchman's life ought to be that is not intellectually alert, socially sympathetic, and politically instructed. If, as we claim, we have an order of ministry, and sacraments of awful and blessed mystery and grace, upon us lies the heavy duty of bringing those supreme influences into a dominant mastery over the strongest forces of our daily life. And of those forces, for good or ill, the Press stands in the front line.

Churchmen would be horrified if they were charged with irreverence in worship or immorality of life. But is it not a grave error if Churchmen, and the clergy especially, suffer one of the most powerful factors in English life to be exploited by Dissent and used by Romans, while the Church is feebly represented, or unfairly treated by the secular Press? We are told that we ought to have a Church party in Parliament. True! But there is even greater need for a Church party in the Press. And by that we do not mean Church papers; but such a use of the secular Press by Churchmen as shall lead to a better understanding by the people of the history and life of the Church. There is no need for sensationalism, for puffing, or for bitter attacks upon those who are not with us. What we want is instruction and education of reading people in all matters that pertain to the Church. Ten years spent in this work would do more for the creating of a just judgment in regard to social and Church questions than any political party alliance, or any mere defence of the Church from specific attacks. It is little use rushing into print in the midst of a grave political and social conflict. The victory to be won at such a time must be organized beforehand; and there is no element in public life so powerful for good or evil as the newspaper. Churchmen have too long ignored that fact. They may neglect to deal with it, but they cannot ignore it in the future. The Press ought to be made a powerful helper of the Church. It is scarcely that now. We are glad to know that one result of the London School Board election has been to awaken both laity and clergy to those obvious facts. It will be worse than foolish if they are lost sight of when the fight is over. For the attacks upon Christian teaching in the Board schools is only the advanced guard of the Liberationists. Their next attack will be upon the Church.—*Illustrated Church News.*

S. JOHN.

Amongst the group of Saints'-days which cluster round the great Christmas Festival, our Church bids us commemorate, on December 27, S. John the Apostle and Evangelist.

In spite of his reticence about himself in his own Gospel, and the innate modesty which led him when narrating any circumstance at which he was either present or in which he was concerned, by substituting the third for the first person singular, we are able to gather much of his personal character from the very manner in which he has written his Gospel, and also to learn many details of his life from what is recorded of him by the three other Evangelists. We are all very familiar with the circumstances of his call on the shore of the Sea of Galilee, and he is a very noticeable figure throughout the record of Christ's ministry from being, together with his elder brother James and the zealous Simon Peter, allowed on several occasions an intimate attendance upon our Lord denied to the other Apostles, and in many ways enjoying His special confidence and favour.

Of all the various names and titles by which he is distinguished, the one which endears him to us the most is that of "the Disciple whom Jesus loved."

Whether or not there is any foundation of truth in the sometimes hazarded conjecture of his nearness of kindred to our Lord, we may safely account for the tender regard entertained by Christ towards him by his own singularly mild and affectionate disposition, and by the devotion which prompted his early dedication of himself as a Disciple (for he was not thirty years of age, and was certainly the youngest when admitted into the number of the Twelve), and which led to his being the only Apostle who was present at the Crucifixion.

Who can for a moment question the ardour of that affection which our Lord evinced towards this His only adherent in the hour of personal danger,