

## THE PRESS ASSOCIATION MEETINGS

VIEWS OF LEADING MEMBERS ON MR. BRIERLEY'S PLAN TO MEET IN SECTIONS.

THE PRINTER AND PUBLISHER has received the following opinions on the recent suggestion of Mr. J. S. Brierley, of St. Thomas, to divide the meetings of the association into sections in order to discuss subjects of interest to daily and weekly publishers in different departments:

A. PALLITO, WOODSTOCK SENTINEL-REVIEW.

"Under the gentle stimulus of your stirring introduction to Mr. Brierley's letter, I am constrained to say that the proposal to hold separate meetings of the Press Association for weekly and daily publishers during one day of our annual gathering seems to be a good one. It would probably increase the interest and value of the programme. It is to be hoped that no capacious member will discover in it a deep laid scheme to prevent the weekly publishers of to day from becoming the daily publishers of to morrow, or to keep the big daily potentates from discovering the plans by which the country publishers hold the fort against their cut-throat rivals, the weekly editions from the big cities. As fears in this direction seem groundless, the Executive would do well to carry Mr. Brierley's idea into effect."

L. S. WILLISON, TORONTO GLOBE.

"The proposal does not impress me favorably. It would look like a tendency to divide the association into two groups with separate interests, and thus be a disintegrating influence rather than a help."

ARTHUR WALLIS, TORONTO MAIL.

"City newspaper men would probably take more interest in the meetings than they do if some such idea were carried out."

W. C. NICHOL, HAMILTON HERALD.

"I think Mr. Brierley's suggestion as to the division of the Press Association an extremely good one, and one that would not only be a good thing for the association as it stands, but would probably materially increase its membership, many city writers holding aloof at present because of the idea that the association has little or no interest for anyone outside of the country publishers."

L. C. JAMIESON, BELLEVILLE INTELLIGENCER.

"Whilst agreeing with Mr. Brierley as to the saving in time by the adoption of his suggestion, such an arrangement would, in my estimation, tend to the estrangement of members of the association, which might more than off-set the loss of time. One of the benefits of the association is its social character, as there acquaintances are formed and friendships ripened between editors and publishers, which has the effect of doing away with much of that growth of personal antagonism arising from editorial controversies. Again, I cannot see but that the publishers of weekly papers must be greatly benefitted by taking part in the deliberations of publishers of daily papers, as the daily is generally the child of the weekly, and the editor of the weekly, although possibly at the time occupying a field that would never call for a daily, might, at any time, be called upon to edit or control a daily in some other and larger field. From Mr. Brierley's standpoint, as editor of a daily, no doubt he would feel that discussions by editors of weekly papers might

not be of much benefit to him in the field he occupies, yet there is a bond of union between the publishers of both which it is well to foster rather than to lead to an estrangement, which would possibly be the result of carrying out the proposed arrangement, and which would be very detrimental to the usefulness of the association. In conclusion I would suggest that we have less playing to the gallery at the meetings, shorter papers and more open discussion."

ROBE. HOLMES, CLINTON NEW ERA.

"Mr. Brierley's suggestion regarding the programme of the annual meeting of the Press Association—that is, for the city men to discuss matters pertaining to the city press by themselves, and the rural journalists to do likewise, with a general session afterwards—does not commend itself to me. I will admit that a greater variety of subjects could be discussed, but I do not believe that greater interest would be taken in the meetings, unless it should lead to a larger attendance of city pressmen, which I doubt. Country journalists have sometimes thought that the subjects discussed were more in the interest of the city than the rural press, but on the principle that all subjects relating to the business were of more or less interest to all engaged in it, have not openly dissented thereto. And it is for this, among other reasons, that I think Mr. Brierley's suggestion would not be acceptable. The country editor gets pointers from discussions that relate chiefly to the city printer, and I have no doubt that the reverse holds good also. If it doesn't it should, for many a country editor can give his city brother points, and not half try. There is another reason why I do not approve of the suggestion, and to my mind the most important one. Some of the country editors have thought that their city brethren were disposed to monopolize or 'run the concern.' I do not think there has been any intentional ground for such a conclusion, but it prevails, nevertheless. Now, if you divide the meeting on the lines proposed, you give color to this very thing, and I fear that no amount of explanation would satisfy some people that it was not so intended. Anything that would in any way cause the slightest friction should be avoided. I know Mr. Brierley too well to suppose for one moment that anything but the best of motives prompted his suggestion, but I'm afraid it is not practicable, for it would divide the interest. Further than this, many country editors some day expect to be city editors, and others who have been city editors are now in the country, so that there is a mutual interest in all topics discussed. Personally, I have no fault to find with programmes of past gatherings. The addresses usually are practical, the interest taken in them is certainly marked, and I believe the general management of the newspaper and printing business has been improved thereby."

F. H. DOBBS, PETERBOROUGH REVIEW.

"What is to be gained by such division? Have not many of the gentlemen of the city press graduated from the country? Who, then, so well fitted to suggest as a publisher with a country education and a city experience? Or do the city men object to educating their confreres from the country? The in-