

represented by the *Quebec Gazette* (when it was edited by John Neilson), *Christian Guardian*, *Toronto Examiner* and *Montreal Pilot*. Since it was nearly impossible to divorce politics from the conduct of a newspaper at this time, editors were usually politicians, and politicians were usually editors as well. Thus such important figures of Canadian history as Edward Whelan, Joseph Howe, James Haszard, Etienne Parent, Ludger Duvernay, Dr. Daniel Tracey, William Lyon Mackenzie and Francis Hincks were representatives of both spheres of the country's life.

Political discussion did not make up the entire newspaper content during this period. Some new features appeared. As communities became a little too large for word-of-mouth coverage, local news began slowly to occupy a somewhat larger place in the press. This was not reported in the objective fashion of the modern news story—even accounts of fires, drownings and other disasters were heavily interlarded with opinion and comment. Local items were often displaced by foreign exchanges which were frequently high in human interest value but usually of little consequence to the reader. Long abstracts from literary classics and near-classics still occupied a large part of newspaper space. But these began to share position with features of more practical interest and usefulness to British North Americans, such as the letters of *Agricola* and *Mephibosheth Stepsure* in the Maritimes. Newspaper reporting of Parliament as we know it today had its beginnings during this period. Advertising gained in prominence and importance. At this time advertisers began to get away from mere announcements of their products, and started to make extravagant claims for items they had to sell. This was particularly true of patent medicines, described in terms that can only seem highly offensive to persons living in the present-day society of Drug and Pure Food Acts and of Better Business Bureaux.

Make-up changes were extremely gradual during this period. The innovations made by James Gordon Bennett Sr. in his *New York Herald* had at this time small influence on the British colonies to the north. The occasional exclamatory bold-face headline-effusions of such men as Mackenzie were motivated by political passion rather than a purely commercial desire to catch the eye of the potential reader. In style and tone, editors wrote copy with an elegance and classical scholarship rarely found today. At the same time the nineteenth century editor was guilty of circumlocutions, discursiveness and, on occasion, pretentiousness. The inverted-pyramid construction of the modern news story was unknown to him. An accompaniment of his subjective news-treatment was his bitter and vituperative attacks on political foes and other persons with whom he disagreed. Invective, diatribe and billingsgate became the measure of the political hot temper of British North American constitutional debate of the period, and the newspapers reflected the spirit of the day. Such press outspokenness was not inconsistent with governmental restrictions which were imposed upon newspaper freedom up to at least the middle of the 1807-to-1858 period: the fact was that while they were most severely curbed in their attempts to discuss the behaviour of those in authority, journalists were usually allowed, for the most part by their victims' defaulting of the issue, the utmost freedom in their treatment of private individuals.

GAINS IN PRESS FREEDOM

The struggle for Responsible Government and the new spirit of vigorous independence which animated the journalism of the second period had important consequences in terms of freedom of the press. Editors became daring enough to challenge the authority of officials to dictate absolutely what newspapers might or might not publish. Since those in power were unwilling to give up easily their legal right to censor the press, innumerable clashes between editors and the authorities took place. In the beginning the consequences were pretty disastrous to the journalists. Pierre Bédard, François Blanchet, Ludger Duvernay, Jocelyn Waller, Dr. Daniel Tracey, Bartimus Ferguson, Richard Cockrel, James Durand, Francis Collins, William Lyon Mackenzie, William Wilkie, Anthony Holland, James Haszard, John Hooper, Dr. Edward Barker, Henry Winton, and R. J. Parsons all suffered because of the outspoken stands they took on questions of public interest. Their story is a monotonous repetition of government victory and newspaper