

A MOST EXCELLENT SUGGESTION.



LETTER from the first vice president of the Ontario Press Association contains a most excellent suggestion. At least, so it seems to the writer. All may not agree as to its excellence, if so, let them do as Mr. Brierley has done, put their thoughts in print for the general benefit of Canadian newspaperdom.

If any person has anything to say,

now is the time. Golden silence is a delusion and a snare on such an occasion as this.

Here is the letter exactly as received.

St. THOMAS, Aug. 7, 1895.

To the Editor of THE PRINTER AND PUBLISHER.

DEAR SIR, Would it not be an excellent idea to hold two concurrent meetings at each annual session of the Canadian Press Association, one to be composed of those members interested in the weekly press, and the other of those more particularly interested in daily publications? The suggestion does not involve the division of the members of the association into two classes, but is made in the hope that, if carried into execution, it would materially add to the value and interest which these annual meetings have for those members engaged wholly on weekly newspapers. Of late years the discussions have certainly tended rather to the advantage of publishers of dailies, by reason of the papers dealing with weekly publications being of service to them, while the discussions respecting dailies were necessarily of little interest to weekly publishers. There are a sufficient number of subjects of common interest to all publishers to engage the attention of the association for one day of its session, but the second day, or at least part of it, might with advantage be devoted to two meetings composed as suggested. I have reason to know that some publishers of weeklies have felt that our meetings have not been as valuable to them as they might have been, and I am free to confess that there has been reason, however unwittingly given, for such a feeling. The growth and vitality of the association, of course, depends on the realization by its members of as large a measure of benefit as can reasonably be expected. If the idea of holding two meetings, and thus specializing the work of the annual session, should result in increasing the value of the association to the publishers of weekly papers, we may expect to see a much larger attendance of these gentlemen at future meetings than has been the case in the past. This is certainly a result to be worked for.

Yours fraternally,

JAS. S. BRIERLEY.

The idea may be original so far as Mr. Brierley is concerned, but we remember hearing it suggested previously. However that may be, it does not effect the value of the proposal, and Mr. Brierley has stated the case clearly and forcibly.

At the first day's meeting there would be the president's

address, the secretary-treasurer's report, the nomination of officers and committees, appointing of auditors and other general business. In this all members would be equally interested, and consequently all would require to meet together. At this first gathering all hand-shaking and nose-rubbing would be done and new acquaintances made. This is a necessary part of the programme, because it revives old friendships, regenerates mouldy acquaintanceships, wipes away old scores, gives the new men a chance to become acquainted and inculcates the good fellowship which should exist among the members of the fourth estate.

It would be the same in the evening, when the social side of the members of the association receives its very necessary polishing. Here all would meet on common ground, for the ability to enjoy a good dinner or a social evening of any kind does not vary very much, not nearly so much as the difference in the ability to give \$10,000 bail to the police court officers. Here all the members are equally interested, and the meeting's success depends on the unanimity of those present in their determination to please and to be pleased.

But at the second day's session the difference would be apparent. For instance, a paper on "Advertising," which would be valuable to the daily publishers, would not be worth a blank to the weekly publisher. A paper on "Circulation by Newsboys" would be valuable to the dailies, and a paper on "Pushing the Circulation of a Weekly" would be valuable to the weeklies. To read them one after the other would be unpleasant for both classes; to read them at the same hour in different rooms would be economical both in time and in patience. A paper on "Machines in Country Offices" would be an excellent contemporary for an article on "City Dailies and the Machines." So would "The Value of Ready-Prints" and "Our Telegraphic Dispatches."

Time and again the editor of this paper has been in receipt of a letter from the weekly publisher, saying that the Press Association, and this journal itself, were shooting over the heads of the publishers of small weeklies. The secretary of the Press Association reports the same thing. When asked to join the association, the smaller publisher declares that the figuring is done on too large a scale for him. PRINTER AND PUBLISHER has tried to remedy this matter, so far as it is concerned, by devoting space to matter of especial interest to the smaller journalists. It remains for the Press Association to do the same.

Mr. Brierley's suggestion seems to be a most valuable one, and if anyone thinks differently let him, as we have suggested, blow his trumpet in the ears of all the people.



THE DIGNITY OF A NEWSPAPER.

By THE EDITOR.

DIGNITY is as essential to a newspaper as to a gentleman. It is a characteristic which is fully as necessary and becoming. It bears fruit just as quickly and as surely; is as impressive and striking. With it a tone is given a newspaper which can be acquired by no other means. According as the paper is dignified so will be the respect and patronage accorded it. It

must be dignified in its editorials, its news, its advertisements and its business methods.

The newspaper must be dignified in its editorials. The policy of the paper may be to support a certain political party, but this can be done without making enemies of those who hold opposite views. Principles can be upheld sternly and strictly,