

CURRENT COMMENT.

EDITORIAL.

THE "NEW JOURNALISM." The crusade now going on in the United States against what is termed the "new journalism," or sensationalism among newspapers, reminds us that the daily press in Canada is by no means free from the charge of being sensational, and vulgar also. It is a deplorable fact that most of the newspapers of this country prefer to emulate their depraved contemporaries on the other side of the line to adopting the staid tone of the press of Great Britain. A comparison of the press of the two countries reveals at once the more desirable one to follow. On the one hand, take for example the *London Times*. "The Thunderer," as it is sometimes called, is conspicuous chiefly for the absence of that which constitutes the main portion of the average American daily, namely, that which deals with the latest murder, suicide, robbery or execution, and the publishing of which seems to be the primary excuse for the existence of the journal. In the *Times*, in place of sensationalism occupying the most conspicuous space, the first position is given to the news of the day, telegraphic reports, cables, special correspondence, etc., which can always be relied upon as being truthful and exact. The latest news is to be had from the Philippines, South Africa, India, Crete, the Soudan, etc.; not padded out in a sensational way, and highly colored to suit the political views of the paper, but the facts stated without a bias by correspondents who may be relied upon and who know that they will be called to account if any statements are made that are not correct. What is the result of this mode of conducting business? First of all there is a feeling of confidence established between the paper and its correspondents and between the correspondents and the paper, the one recognizing that the other can be relied upon to furnish only information that is reliable, and the other knowing that the greater value will be set by the public upon the

correspondence appearing in that paper, which is recognized as a reliable authority upon all public matters. Thus the public are gainers. The general reader is not long in determining which journal can be counted on for authenticated news and which cannot, and in the case of the *Times*, the public, years ago, learnt to accept the reports and despatches of that journal as having good foundation, so that to-day whatever the *Times* says, either editorially or in its news columns, is looked upon as gospel both in England and America, whereas its telegraphic and cable despatches are seized upon and used as pabulum by the newspaper press the world over. This is the result of discountenancing everything that savors of sensationalism, or, at least, of publishing only that which is known to be accurate. We do not wish it to be supposed that sensational journals do not exist in the old country, or unreliable ones, either, for that would be far from the truth; but the percentage of such journals is very much below what it is in America, and the weight they have with the public is next to *nil*, and in no way to be compared with the influence which the journals of this class exercise in the States. There are dozens of papers in England actuated by principles similar to those that move the *Times*, and the sensational sheet is the exception. In the United States, however, the great mass of the papers seem to vie with one another in being as vulgar and sensational as possible, without paying the least attention as to the authenticity of the matter published.

Take, for example, the news that comes from Cuba through American sources. Fiction more pure and unadulterated was never penned by any novelist with the most fervid imagination. It is a common thing to read of massacres of women and children in one paragraph and to have the entire statement contradicted in the next, to be told of the total defeat of General Weyler and the ex-