

where it has the field to itself. But the field in which local news is interesting is limited. In an ordinary way, readers are not concerned about the minor happenings in a range wider than, say, 20 or 30 miles. Yet, these happenings are what the people want in a local newspaper. As soon as you go outside your immediate local field, you are estimated by comparison with the city weekly, which gives double or treble the quantity of matter you could possibly get together, at half the price, in many cases.

3. The circulation of the average country newspaper of the better class, I take it, ranges from 1,000 to 3,000. If these figures were doubled, which would entail tremendous effort, and would represent an enormous advance, I do not believe the quantity of advertising or the price received for it would be materially increased.

4. To double the circulation of a country newspaper would very considerably add to the cost of production, faster machinery being needed, among other things. I do not think that machine-set type cuts any figure in a paper where the weekly is the only edition published. In such offices the rule is to run the job printing and the paper as one department, and a certain number of hands are necessary, some of whom would be idle a good deal of the time if the machine were run to its full capacity. Part machine slugs and part movable type is an abomination to a neat printer.

5. There should be a profit all round to make the business of publishing a paper go. At \$1 a year there is a fair margin of profit on the white paper; at 50c. there is none, and nothing, so far as I can see, to make up the deficiency in that important item.

MR. H. P. MOORE,  
ACTON FREE  
PRESS.

I think the position of my friend, Mr. Albert Dennis, of New Glasgow, N.S., in **PRINTER AND PUBLISHER**, is untenable. Your expression, in last issue, that "50c. a year is too dangerously near the profit-margin point," is very reasonable, and, withal, true to fact, as the experience of several publishers who experimented with the low rate gives evidence. The instances Mr. Dennis cites, where low rates are alleged to have won the success achieved, fail, I think, to prove his contention. It is well known that the bulk of The Montreal Star's daily circulation is sold on the street at 1c.—\$3.12 per year; that its rate to regular subscribers is \$3 per year. It is true, clergymen, teachers and postmasters receive it at a reduced rate, but I venture The Star has not built its circulation nor made its profits from the latter classes. The Star's weekly edition, with its circulation of 115,000, is \$1. With reference to the weekly paper quoted, I think the publisher himself regards the 50c. rate, as yet, in the light of an experiment.

In my opinion, the successful, well-printed, carefully-edited weekly of the future will demand a subscription rate of at least \$1 per year. It is true, paper is cheaper and machine composition is some cheaper than hand composition, but the production of news to-day is more expensive, and the matter of changing advertisements costs one-half more than it did 10 years ago.

There is no profit in a country weekly with an ordinarily-attainable circulation under \$1 per year. The reduction in the subscription rates of weeklies from \$1.50 and \$1.25 to \$1 was not because the publishers felt these rates to be unreasonably

high, but because the big weekly editions of the metropolitan dailies were put into close competition with them.

MR. R. D. WARREN,  
GEORGETOWN  
HERALD.

I do not think there is much (if any) profit in publishing a weekly of a thousand or under, at less than \$1; and it seems utterly impossible for the country weekly, taking the Province over, to average more than this.

In our own little county (Halton), for instance, there are published five weeklies, besides the Herald, each one of the five being an excellent local paper. Then, in adjoining counties the ground is fully covered, and it is not possible to increase circulation beyond a thousand without encroaching upon the territory of some good brother, who is as deserving of a living as the rest of us. This, I fancy, is the condition the country over. I may say that, in our constituency, there is little demand and no clamoring for cheap local papers, which, by the way, is fortunate for those who publish "all-home-prints," whose circulation does not exceed a thousand, and where typographers are not practical.

MR. J. W. DAFOE,  
MONTREAL  
WEEKLY STAR.

I doubt whether my opinion amounts to much, as my experience has been obtained only with a metropolitan publication, which, of course, differs in many respects from the local newspaper. The publishers of The Family Herald and Weekly Star have not found it necessary to reduce the price. With the cheapening of production they began to give their readers more for their money; and the paper increased in size from 8 to 12 pages; then to 16; then to 20; and, finally, to 24. The price has never been cut; and for clubbing and agents there is an ironclad minimum price. Though we have had to compete with 50c. papers, they have, to all appearances, done us next to no harm, for our circulation has grown steadily year by year; and is now considerably in excess of the one hundred thousand mark.

My own personal opinion is that \$1 is not too much to ask for a weekly, whether country or city; and it can be got if the paper is made worth it. Of course, if the publisher chooses to run his paper on unchanged lines from those he followed when the cost of production was twice what it is now, he will find that he will have to cut his price in two to hold his readers. It is simply a case of value received. A good paper at \$1 a year will get about as many subscribers as a paper only half as good at 50c. If you start cutting, why stop at 50c.; why not run a yet smaller paper and charge 25c.? "The Kansas City Weekly Star is only 25c. a year; and the example may spread. You can certainly put me down as a believer in \$1 newspapers.

The two new cover papers advertised by Buntin, Gillies & Co., Hamilton, in this issue are worthy of notice. The cheaper one, the "Taffeta," is an antique wove paper of medium weight, in six delicate tints. For such an artistic line it is the cheapest ever offered. The second is the "Sultan," also in antique finish, but heavy and in strong dark colors—guaranteed fast. This paper is made from rope manila stock and is suitable for the highest class of work. The papers are both entirely new. Sample-books are being prepared and will be mailed to all applicants by the Hamilton firm.