

NEWSPAPER MEN AND TITLES.

If the newspaper men of Canada—all sizes, ages, political opinions or creeds—were canvassed on the subject of knight-hoods they would probably declare, by a large majority, against having any at all in this country. Not because journalists have always been passed over in the distribution of these honors, but for other reasons, chiefly controversial, and not necessary to be discussed here and now.

It remains, however, a notable fact that no Canadian newspaper man, in his capacity as such, has ever been given a title. Sir George Brown declined the honor, though it appears to have been actually conferred upon him, willy nilly, if we are to accept the evidence of the recent work on colonial notabilities published in England. But this was for his services as a plenipotentiary to Washington on behalf of Great Britain in 1874, and doubtless also for his eminent abilities. The rest of us have never been overburdened with offers of knighthood.

In England, however, of late the tendency has been to single out journalists and literary men. Lord Rosebery has made a feature of this tendency, as the two last batches of Queen's Birthday decorations show. The most Radical of journalists got the honor. Such men as Sir John Robinson, editor of *The London Daily News*; Sir John Long, of *The Dundee Courier*; Sir Wemyss Reid, of *The Speaker*, and others, all exemplify this. In Canada the titles go to politicians, professional men or judges—none to journalists. Yet Sir John Willison, of *The Globe*; Sir Christopher Bunting, of *The Mail*; Sir John Ross Robertson, of *The Telegram*, or Sir Hugh Graham, of *The Star*, and others, would all wear it well. As Mr. Charles Coghlan says in the play, "W-h-y n-o-t?" Echo answers, why?

LAWYERS AND FAKE ACTIONS.

HERE is an advertisement from a recent issue of *The New York Herald*, which will strike a responsive chord in the breast of the Canadian newspaper publisher:

Wanted:

GENTLEMAN of nice appearance and address to drum up business for lawyer on commission; big money to right man. Lawyer, 132 Herald.

This is putting it rather plainly. On this side of the boundary lawyers do not show their hand so frankly, though some of their business is certainly "drummed up," such as libel suits against newspapers. The number of fake actions and unnecessary suits brought against newspapers is swelled away beyond reasonable proportion by the lawyers who manufacture an aggrieved client and stand the expenses until some return is got out of the paper.

Unless publishers themselves take these gentry in hand, and thoroughly show them up, we may look in vain for any vigorous measures from the legal profession itself. Yet it is clearly the business of the profession to stop it. We have given to lawyers, through Acts of Parliament, the most extraordinary powers. They are allowed to say who shall be, and who shall not be, lawyers. They are permitted to decide when a member of their profession has disgraced himself. They can strike his name off the list of barristers if the governing body of the legal fraternity so resolve. Yet we do not find, in return for these exceptional

privileges conferred upon lawyers, that there is any evidence of constant vigilance to protect the general public from legal tramps and legal frauds.

On the contrary, it is a rare thing to find one of the brethren disrobed. The other day a Toronto lawyer who had been found boodling in civic affairs was stricken from the roll. It took the legal incubator nearly six months to hatch out a verdict. The punishment came late, and was reduced to a minimum, seeing that the culprit had already left the country and migrated "to fresh woods and pastures new." As a rule, the governing body of the bar exhibits the strongest reluctance to purge the profession of black sheep. When a suspect is actually hauled before the legal Star Chamber, closed doors shut out the impertinent curiosity of the general public. If he gets off, he is free to go and sin again, no man the wiser. When the ordinary citizen transgresses, he has to stand all the notoriety of a public trial, and bear forever afterwards some of its awkward consequences, and oftentimes its odious stigma. Why permit this discrimination to continue, if the power which confers it is not going to be used with constant watchfulness to protect the public and punish fraud?

If newspapers had this power to regulate their own profession and punish offenders—and I am not prepared to say that it would be an unmixed benefit either to themselves or the community at large if they did possess it—they would at least exercise needed discipline with a far greater degree of justice and sagacity than the law societies do. Publishers are very long-suffering in this matter of fake actions. They will soon be forced to begin a regular campaign against the existing power of close corporations.

WANTED.—ADVERTISING AND SUBSCRIPTION MANAGER, for a Western Ontario daily; one with a knowledge of job printing preferred. Address, stating salary expected and experience. "PUSH," PRINTER AND PUBLISHER office.

