

# MCGILL FORTNIGHTLY

A Fortnightly Journal of Literature, University Thought and Event.

VOL. IV.

MONTREAL, MARCH 4, 1896.

No. 11

## McGill Fortnightly.

### \* EDITORIAL BOARD \*

Editor-in-chief—ROBERT T. MULLIN (Law '96).

Secretary—J. C. ROBERTSON (Arts '96).

HARRI DELL (Comp. Med. and Vet. Sc. '96). WM. McDUGALL (Sc. '96).

W. B. MOWATT, B.A. (Med. '96). MISS W. J. FITCHER (Donalda '96)

DR. R. TAIT MCKENZIE (Graduates Society).

### \* BUSINESS BOARD \*

S. G. ARCHIBALD (Arts '97), Chairman.

EDGAR N. ARMSTRONG, B.A. (Law '97). MISS M. HUTCHINSON (Donalda '96).

WM. FREDERICK (Med. '96). J. W. BELL (Sc. '97).

J. J. MCCARREY (Comp. Med. and Vet. Sc. '96).

The MCGILL FORTNIGHTLY is published by the Students of the University on the Wednesday of every second week during the College Session.

The annual subscription is \$1.00, payable strictly in advance. Remittance to be made to the Chairman of the Business Board, 113 McKay Street, Montreal. Single copies may be obtained at Wm. Drysdale & Co.'s, E. M. Renouf's, Cyrus Ashford's, Chapman's and W. Foster Brown's, Booksellers. Price, 10 cents.

Address Contributions to Editor-in-Chief, 105 St. Hubert Street, Montreal.

## EDITORIAL COMMENTS.

### "COLLEGE CRITICS" AGAIN.

A few weeks ago, our big, good-natured brother, *The Gazette*, made us the subject of some friendly banter with respect to an editorial published in one of our issues recently, on the subject of Journalism. We had suggested that the public press was not absolutely perfect, and that certain objectionable features might be cured. But we endeavored to pave the way to these gentle strictures by the most profuse, yet sincere, praise of the press and press-men generally.

Our contemporary, the *Queen's Quarterly*, in a moment of weakness published an article on the same subject, and thereupon *The Gazette* proceeded good-humoredly to banter us both. 'Really,' says *The Gazette*, 'we are doing the best we can. There are defects, but when you grow a little older and begin to have some experience of life and knowledge of the world, you will find that there is nothing perfect, and that it is very hard to get anything near to perfection—much less a newspaper.' We are pleased that *The Gazette* has chosen to take us in this wise. We are well aware that the great journal might have come forward in anger, and annihilated

us both. The metropolitan journals have always treated us with great consideration: they have exchanged on even terms with us; and when they take a note from our columns or give us a complimentary paragraph, which they not infrequently do, we take it as a special kindness, and begin to feel that, after all, our college journal is getting on in the world. Nevertheless, we have yet a thought on this subject of journalism, and we come forward to record it with a due and proper fear, and a solemn appreciation of the great tutorial presence; but we beseech *The Gazette* not to harden its heart, nor under the prickle of our guileless compunction to smite us too cruelly. And this time our captious spirit has not to do with language, nor sensationalism, nor prize fights, but with a very important matter, near to the hearts of a large number of our students, and particularly to members of the literary society,—to wit, the singular manner of reporting the political news of the day, and especially the parliamentary debates. In this department of newspaper work there has within late years been a vast amelioration, but it has been due, not to any radical reform in the newspaper sanctuary from whence issue the springs of newspaper vitality, but to a decadence of rabid partyism, a more manly independence, and a higher sense of fair play among the younger generation of electors. Read a newspaper of 20 years ago. Whether it be Tory or Reform, one will search in vain for a true and impartial report of a parliamentary debate or a political meeting, in which the predominating political element is represented by the opposite party. The whole meeting or debate is in the reporter's hands; it is at his mercy. So are not only the speakers, but the whole body of readers. He could and did add, diminish, pervert and prevaricate. Of course, where a verbatim report was given, this was not possible, nor could it occur in the hands of a perfectly fair-minded and truth-loving reporter. Even in giving a report of a political meeting or debate, without changing a word by judicious omissions, a speaker can be made to say most marvellous things. Now-a-days, what the people want is information;—a plain, true, unvarnished report of what is said or done. The statement that Mr. So-and-So "took up the House's time for an hour" will neither convince one section of readers nor please the other. If a report cannot