

Printer AND Publisher.

VOL. V.—No. 4

TORONTO, APRIL, 1896.

\$2.00 PER YEAR.

A JOURNAL FOR PRINTERS AND PUBLISHERS

PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY

THE MACLEAN PUB. CO., LTD.

TRADE JOURNAL PUBLISHERS AND
FINE MAGAZINE PRINTERS

No. 26 FRONT ST. WEST, TORONTO

Subscription \$2.00 per annum.

Single copies 20 cents.

J. B. MACLEAN,
President

HUGH C. MACLEAN,
Sec.-Treas.

CURRENT NOTES.

THE latest story of a newspaper man at a Salvationist meeting is as good as the one which preceded it. It will be remembered that General Booth, once seeing a man rise near the platform with papers in his hand preparing to leave, asked him if he were saved. The individual said no, he was a reporter. This time the scene is laid in Melbourne during the General's Australian tour. A reporter rose at a critical point in the service to go out. "Brother," cried the General, "you will be damned if you go now." Replied the reporter: "I shall be damned by the city editor if I don't go." "But the Lord is greater than the city editor," said the General warningly. "The city editor does not think so," was the retort.

In the department of this journal devoted to news of the paper trade will be found an account of the activity of the Canadian mills at present, owing to the demand for news print. The extra large issues of our daily and weekly press just now are said to explain the greater demand for paper. Perhaps increased circulation may also be a factor. It is a fact that the demand for newspapers is greater in a time of political excitement like the present. However, the chief point for publishers to consider is whether the profits justify an increased outlay for paper. The cost of paper is the biggest item in the office bill. When the blanket form was abandoned a few years ago, the idea was that there would be some condensation of matter. Yet our dailies are spreading out into magazines on the least provocation. It seems to us a note of warning is in season.

One hears a good deal of sympathy for the tired members of Parliament during the continuous sittings of the House of

Commons. A far severer strain is that imposed on the newspaper men in the Gallery. The members appear to be qualified for duty when they can work their jaws only. The correspondents have to work their brains.

The Press Association of the Province of Quebec has risen to the value of the social aspect of a press association by holding an enjoyable dinner. No better result follows from societies like this than the bringing together of newspaper men in friendly intercourse. Much of the acerbity of controversy in print disappears when the writers know one another. One of the reasons why the admirable editorial tone of The Toronto Globe has been so consistently maintained during the past few years is owing to the amicable relations existing between the editors of the paper and their journalistic confreres. The Quebec association is to be congratulated on its enjoyable re-union, which cannot fail to have a good effect. An association with experienced and popular men like Mr. Harper, of The Witness, and Mr. Mason, of The Trade Bulletin, at its head cannot fail to do good work in promoting the unity of the profession.

The English papers are denied the privilege claimed by our dailies of printing statements concerning law suits pending in court. The editors are fined for contempt without mercy. The Saturday Review of March 28 says:

"When are the newspapers, which are constantly being told—after dinner—that they are such a 'power in the land' going to take up the question of contempt of the Court? Judge-made libel is bad enough, but even in the libel trial, if a judge flagrantly misdirects the jury, there is always an appeal. In the case of contempt of court there is no jury and no appeal, and the decision—it may be imprisonment, or it may be a thousand pounds fine for the unhappy editor—depends absolutely on the temper or the digestion of the gentleman who happens for the occasion to be witness, advocate, judge and jury all in one. This week an evening newspaper was hauled before the Divisional Court for publishing the statement of claim in a pending case. Such an act has, we fancy, never been held to be contempt before. Mr. Justice Day, it is true, declared that it was 'a gross and scandalous contempt of court,' but then he always says that. Mr. Justice Wright was more cautious, and 'doubted whether it came within the doctrine of contempt.' And so the editor got off by paying the costs. In other words, he was fined, at a moderate estimate, forty or fifty pounds arbitrarily and without trial or possibility of appeal. There is not a week that this sort of thing does not happen, and the total sum levied from newspapers every year must amount to many thousands of pounds; but nobody seems to mind."