

GENTLEMEN OF THE PRESS.

AMONG the many faithful and useful, but unrecognized and unhonored servants of the public, the reporter for the press is especially distinguished. Next to the ubiquitous but anonymous policeman, he is at once the best and the least known public character of our acquaintance. Hundreds of thousands of persons read his articles in the newspapers, day after day, without ever being aware of his existence. Beyond a small professional circle he is almost wholly unknown; for, unlike most writers, he has not the privilege of attaching his name to his published productions. Copies of the *Acta Diurna*, those embryo newspapers of Rome spoken of by Seneca and quoted by Tacitus, have come down to us containing reports of cases of assault, of fires on Mount Cælius, of brawls at the Hog-in-Armor tavern, of arrests for giving light weight, of the proceedings in the Senate, and of the pleadings at the courts—reports which show us that the ancient Romans were really men and women, and not such stately oratorical burlesques of humanity as some dramatists and novelists would have us believe; but the reporters who collected these news items and indited the *Acta Diurna* are lost forever in oblivion. A library at Florence is enriched by several volumes of the Venetian *Gazette*, the first newspaper issued in the world; but the reporters of the *Gazette* have shared the fate of their Roman predecessors. A few of the names of those English reporters, who, from 1622 until 1826, labored devotedly to give the English press existence, freedom, respectability, and position have been fortunately preserved to us; but the majority of them were long since forgotten. A single number of the first newspaper printed in America, and published at Boston, in 1690, is deposited in the State Paper Office at London, and our own libraries contain specimens of the first paper regularly issued here, called the *Boston News Letter*, and printed, in 1704, by John Allan, Pudding Lane; but we have no record of the reporters for these early sheets. Obscurity and oblivion are, therefore, the legitimate inheritance of our modern reporters. With very few exceptions they enjoy their inheritance undisturbed. The credit and fame to which they are justly entitled are divided between the newspapers for which and the editors for whom they write. Readers of newspapers remark: "The *Herald* says so-and-so, this morning;" or else: "Mr. Greeley has a fine article in to-day's *Tribune*." In the former case, the identity of the reporter is completely lost in that of the newspaper. In the latter case, the avowed editor is presumed to write every article in his journal, even though he may be absent in California or Europe; just as General Jackson, though dead, is supposed by certain rare old Democrats to be a candidate at every presidential election. In both cases the fact that there is such a person as the reporter is practically ignored. He lives to give the world the latest news, at the earliest

moment, and in his best possible style. He dies unknown and unregretted by those for whom he has written every day for years: or rather he never dies; for a new reporter rises, Phoenix-like, from his ashes and continues his unhonored labors. He makes other men famous, but is himself unnoticed. He is, as Macaulay says, the historian of the times; but his own achievements are unrecorded. Every one profits by his work; but all are ignorant of or do not appreciate his labors. Like the sun, he is a universal, indispensable, but commonly unnoticed benefactor.

The organization of the literary—and, indeed, of every other—department of a first-class daily paper, like the *Times* of London, or the *Herald, Tribune*, or *Times* of New York, is as varied and complex as that of an army. The chief editor, who is usually the proprietor or one of the proprietors, has the general direction of the whole journal and the especial control of the editorial columns. The chief editor is rarely accessible to the public, and is seldom seen by the majority of his subordinates. In England his very name is never officially known even to the employés of his establishment. One of the best reporters of the London *Times*, while on a professional visit to this country, stated that he had never seen the chief editor of that paper, and addressed all his letters to "The Editor of the London *Times*," and not to Charles Delane, Esq., the chief of the editorial staff. In this country, however, no such reserve is attempted, and Messrs. Bennett, Greeley, Raymond, and others publicly announce themselves as the editors and proprietors of their respective journals; although Mr. Raymond has a partner or two in the *Times*, and the *Tribune* is the property of an Association. Next in rank to the chief editor is the managing or business editor, who receives and transacts business with the public; opens and reads all letters and communications addressed to the paper; decides what is, and what is not, to be published; arranges and assigns the daily duties of the reportorial staff; carefully revises, corrects, or amends, the proofs or manuscripts of all articles intended for publication; gives all important reports proper and attractive headings; and, in short, embraces in his multifarious duties a complete supervision of the entire establishment.

Ranking after the managing editors are the assistant editors or editorial writers, who write out the editorials upon subjects selected, and often from notes dictated by the editor-in-chief. The assistant editors are generally highly educated men and very able writers. The editor, whose powerful articles gained for the London *Times* the synonym of "The Thunderer," was one of these assistants, and had to be carefully crammed with facts and dates before he could begin writing. This done, however, the words, the illustrations, the logic, and the rhetoric were his own and unrivaled. The assistant editors are not at all responsible for the statements made or the opinions expressed in their articles, and are

not allowed, therefore, to claim the credit or discredit of their authorship. On the London *Times*, if an editorial writer publicly acknowledges that he has written an editorial he is immediately discharged. Two of the assistant editors have special duties: one being the financial editor, with charge of the money articles, and the other, the dramatic and musical critic. The sub-editors, who are practically the assistants of the managing editor, are next in order, and comprise the night editor, who receives and arranges the latest telegraphic and other reports, and has charge of the paper after about eleven o'clock P.M.; the news (or scissors) editor, who looks over the domestic exchanges, marks important articles for the notice of the chief editor, and clips all interesting news items either for publication or for his carefully-indexed scrap books; the foreign news editor, who goes through the same routine with the foreign exchanges; the ship-news editor, who collects and arranges the marine reports; the military and naval editors, who attend to the miscellaneous matters of their respective departments, and revise all articles connected with the army and navy; the commercial editor, who writes up the city commercial and market reports; the city editor, who collects city items and is properly the head of the reporters' corps; the translators, who inspect the French, Spanish, German, South American, and other foreign papers, and translate all noticeable articles; and, lastly, the biographical editor, who keeps the sketches of the lives of all distinguished contemporaries in readiness for instant use in case an obituary is hastily demanded, or some new success makes the biography of a hero or statesman of interest to the public.

The remainder of the literary attachés of a newspaper are included under the generic name of reporters for the press; but are usually divided into foreign, domestic, and special correspondents and local reporters. The regular foreign correspondents are stationed at the capitals of foreign countries, and are generally hangers-on of the legations, sometimes with, but oftener without, an official position. The domestic correspondents are regularly appointed to the home capitals and larger cities. The Washington, Albany, Boston, and Philadelphia correspondents of the New York papers are examples of this class of reporters, as are also the Liverpool and Manchester correspondents of the London journals. Besides these there are occasional correspondents in every city and town in the country, who write when they have any thing of interest to transmit, and are paid accordingly. The special correspondents are not stationary, but are liable to be sent off at any time to any place at an hour's notice. They travel with and report the doings of any distinguished personages, as the Prince of Wales, President Lincoln, or the Japanese Princes. They report important trials in distant courts, or describe processions, parades, or remarkable funerals in other cities. At present the special reporters of the American papers are all at the

wars, and are called war correspondents. The corps has also been largely but not permanently increased, and our leading papers have one or more representatives at every important military post, and with every division of our numerous armies. The reporters with special departments rank after the special reporters, and are the law, the day and night police, the fire and the common council reporters, whose titles sufficiently indicate the work they have to perform. Last of all are the local reporters, whose province embraces every thing of interest about the city and its suburbs, from a public meeting to a dog-fight. Certain of these local reporters are detailed for Jersey City, Williamsburg, Brooklyn, etc., when connected with New York papers, and are employed as special correspondents when necessary. Besides all these there are the telegraphic correspondents of the Associated Press—an association of seven New York papers; the *Herald*, *Tribune*, *Times*, *World*, *Journal of Commerce*, *Sun*, and *Express*—which has its agents in every part of this country and Canada in telegraphic communication with New York city; and also at St. Johns, Newfoundland, Cape Race, and Father Point, where they intercept and obtain the latest news from foreign steamers. If the reader will take up any of our leading journals he can at once trace the labors of every one of these species of journalists, from the chief editor down to the local reporter. He will see the distinction between the telegrams from regular or special correspondents and those of the Associated Press; the letters from foreign and our national and State capitals; the clippings of the sub-editors; the work of the translators and biographers; the money, commercial, market, fire, musical, police, law, local, dramatic, short-hand and common council report; the editorial articles, inspired by the chief and written by the assistant editors, and the evident marks of the combination and arrangement of the managing editor throughout all, and giving consistency to all these varied departments. He can thus understand, at once and without difficulty, the complicated but necessary organization of a daily newspaper, as far as the literary department is concerned; and we can assure him that the business and mechanical departments are equally systematized, and their work as thoroughly classified, subdivided, and regulated.

A history of the newspaper press and of those who originated and established it is not within the province of this article. Those interested in that subject will find almost all the accessible information concerning it in Hunt's "Fourth Estate: A Contribution to the History of Newspapers," or in Andrew's later, more complete and authentic, and better-arranged "History of the British Press"—books which can be obtained at any of our public libraries. We propose to treat only of the modern reporter for the press, who is almost peculiar to England and America. In France the editors of newspapers are universally regarded as gentlemen, and have

a better recognized social position than in any other country. This arises partly from the fact that the French press is a recognized Government organ, and its editors share its official character; and partly from the fact that the French newspaper writers are not anonymous, but each prints his name at the end of his articles, and is ready to account for his statements in any manner the aggrieved person may prefer, from a suit at the courts of law to a duel in the Bois de Boulogne. The French papers have no reporters of any note, however. Their local news is very brief, and its publication very much delayed. Just as Washington is ignorant of its own doings until it reads the New York journals, so Paris generally receives its first information upon local topics from the London papers. Reports of fires, murders, robberies, and other interesting items, so dear to our reporters, reach the French papers through the police authorities, and are published whenever and in whatever form the police authorities choose. The proceedings of the Corps Legislatif are furnished to the press by an official Government reporter. The speeches and addresses of distinguished orators are printed from the manuscripts. In a word, France has a rigorous Government censorship of the press, and enterprising and original reporters are therefore impossible; for, during the present war, our own experience has demonstrated the fact that perfect freedom of the press is absolutely necessary to accurate, reliable, and complete reports. In other European countries the same state of affairs exists as in France; although in Russia and Germany there are a few excellent newspapers and admirable reporters.

Only in England and America, where the press is regarded as the safeguard of liberty, the organ of the people, the terror of evil-doers, the praise of them that do well, the mirror of the age and times, and the familiar history of the country—does the newspaper reporter fully develop his peculiar characteristics. In this country especially the reporter is in his element, and displays his greatest powers. The differences between an English and an American reporter are, in brief, the differences between England and America, or between the New York *Herald* and the London *Times*. The English reporters are better paid than our reporters, do much less work, and, when employed on the leading dailies of London, receive pensions when incapacitated for further service either by age or by injuries received in the discharge of their duties. Our own reporters are generally much younger men than the English; for, as they grow old, they either rise to editorial dignities, or relinquish the note-book and pencil for more lucrative avocations. The English reporters are usually men of more finished education and greater literary ability than those of the American press. No regular American reporter ever made such a splendid reputation as Russell brought with him to this country, or as Woods won by his Crimean letters, his description of the *Agamemnon* in a storm, and his report of the Heenan and Sayers prize-fight.

This superior literary merit of the English reporters is aided by (and in part accounts for) the superior standing and influence of the first-class English papers. Most of the best literary men of both countries have been newspaper writers; but in America these gentlemen have contributed mainly to the editorial or miscellaneous departments, while in England such authors as Dickens and Thackeray have enlisted as reporters, and taken their places in the gallery at Parliament or their desks at the police courts. The consequence is, that in America these talented but occasional literary journalists are known and receive the credit of their work; in England this credit is added to the reputation of the newspaper.

We dwell long upon this literary superiority, because in every thing else the English reporters are surpassed by the American. Especially is this the case in regard to the celerity with which news is obtained, transmitted, and published. The English reports are well written, but tardy. The American reports are often bad specimens of composition, but they always place the news before the public speedily. The English reporters use the telegraph seldom, and but for very brief dispatches. The American reporters always employ the telegraph when it is accessible, and transmit column after column of reports daily. The London *Times* sent Mr. Woods to America, at an enormous expense, to report the progress of the Prince of Wales. Mr. Woods's reports were nicely written, though often inaccurate, but few of them were ever published in the *Times* except as historical records; for their news was regularly anticipated by the telegraphic dispatches of the New York papers, which often reached England weeks in advance of Woods's letters.

But the reporter for the press not only represents the characteristics of the country but also those of the newspaper to which he belongs. At least three-fourths of the reporters for the New York press are Englishmen and Irishmen, and yet their reports are very different from those which they would write for the London or Dublin papers. Indeed so marked are the distinctive peculiarities of different newspapers, and so strongly are they reflected in the style and deportment of the employés, that no professional journalist would confound a reporter for the *Herald* with a reporter for the *Tribune*; nor could he, in most instances, fail to identify a report written for one of these journals, even though it should happen by some accident to be printed in the other. Thus the reporters of one paper are remarkable for audacity, enterprise, and independence; those of another paper for eccentricity of dress, style, and opinion; those of a third paper for their gentlemanly and reserved deportment, their industry, and the fairness of their articles.

During the Prince of Wales's visit to this country some of the best reporters of the New York press were pitted against each other, and a most intense, bitter, and often amusing rivalry was

maintained. At Niagara Falls an incident occurred during the Prince's stay, which illustrates some of the peculiarities of reporters, and which has been frequently, but never correctly, related by the English papers as a proof of American enterprise. The special reporter of a New York journal had ordered the telegraph line to be kept open, one Sunday evening, when the offices were usually closed, and had engaged to pay the operators liberally for their extra work. Before he had finished telegraphing his usual reports along came the reporter of another New York journal, who, having obtained some exclusive news, and finding the line in fine working order, asserted his right to have his dispatches transmitted to New York also. Reporter the first resisted. Reporter the second insisted. Reporter the first appealed to the telegraph operators, and after a great deal of conversation between the Niagara and Rochester offices, the operators decided that both reports must be telegraphed. Reporter the second was calmly triumphant and coolly prepared his notes. Reporter the first attempted to bribe the operators, and finding them incorruptible, began a long and desultory argument over the wires in order to kill time and crowd out his opponent. Reporter the second thereupon obtained an interview with the Hon. John Rose, the Premier of Canada, who sent down a message to the operators that he was or had been President, Vice-President, or a Director—he really could not tell which—of the Telegraph Company, and that by virtue of this authority he ordered both dispatches to be telegraphed immediately. This order added fuel to the fire of indignation which glowed in the bosom of Reporter the first. A Canadian official dictate to an American reporter? Never! Meanwhile the moments slipped hurriedly away, and the hour was approaching when it would be useless to attempt to send a dispatch to New York in time for publication in the morning papers. Observing this, Reporter the first suddenly recovered his self-control and referred all the parties concerned to the standard rule of the Telegraph Company that "dispatches must be sent in the order in which they were received, and that one dispatch must be finished before another could be transmitted." This rule was acknowledged to be telegraphic law. Reporter the first then claimed priority for his report. This point was also conceded. The reporter then briefly but eloquently informed the bystanders that they might as well go to bed as his report could never be concluded while a chance of a dispatch reaching New York that night remained to his competitor. Immediately he set to work to telegraph against time. His original report having been dispatched he jotted down every item worth sending, and ransacked his brain for any little incident of the Prince's doings which might possibly have been forgotten. His pencil flew over the paper like lightning. Click—click—click—the operator hurried off page after page almost as rapidly as the reporter

could indite them. Reporter the second stalked gloomily up and down the office, despairing but unconquered. To him the minute-hand of the clock moved with terrible swiftness. To Reporter the first the moments seemed shod with lead. Every item being exhausted, a description of Niagara Falls, carefully reserved to be sent by mail, was handed to the operator and flashed over the line at a cost of six or eight cents a word. This done, there was a moment's pause. Reporter the first reflected. Reporter the second breathed more freely, and even ventured to smile hopefully and nervously finger his detained dispatches. Alas! Reporter the first again writes—this time a note to the Rochester operator: "Which would you prefer to telegraph, a chapter of the Bible or a chapter of Claude Duval the highwayman? These are the only two books I can find in the hotel." The lightning dashes off with the query and returns with the answer: "It is quite immaterial which you send." The Reporter seizes the Bible; transcribes the first chapter of Matthew, with all its hard, genealogical names; adds this to his previous dispatches; tacks portions of the twenty-first chapter of Revelation—describing the various precious stones—to the incongruous report; hands it all to the operator; sends his blessing and an injunction to be careful of the spelling to the Rochester office, and gleefully awaits the result with his eyes on the clock. Before this Scriptural news is fully transmitted the hour arrived when no more telegrams could be sent. Reporter the first retired in glory; but although his telegrams reached New York safely, the Biblical portions were unfortunately never published. Reporter the second telegraphed his news and his indignation the next morning, and then good-naturedly acknowledged his defeat.

Until very recently a strong prejudice existed against reporters for the press. The early English newspaper men endured a martyrdom of arrests, fines, and imprisonments before they succeeded in forcing the Government to allow them to report the proceedings of public bodies. At first they were not granted admittance to either House of Parliament, a noble lord declaring that if the proceedings of Parliament were reported that body would be looked upon as one of the most contemptible on the face of the earth. Guthrie and Doctor Johnson, the first Parliamentary reporters, used to pick up the leading ideas of the debates by hearsay, and then write out the speeches in their own words for the *Gentleman's Magazine*. The accuracy of these reports may be judged from the fact that Doctor Johnson once remarked of them: "You may be sure that I took care that the Whig dogs should never have the best of the argument." This mode of reporting Parliament was continued for years; but during the greater part of the time publishers of newspapers and magazines were forbidden, under heavy penalties, to print the names of the speakers, and therefore invented all sorts of classical and fanciful titles

by which to describe and distinguish the different members. The introduction of short-hand made Doctor Johnson's style of reporting obsolete, and in 1826 reporters were at last permitted in Parliament. Still, they were obliged to sit or stand with the rest of the unofficial spectators of the proceedings, no accommodations whatever being provided for the press. While Pitt was Premier all the reporters consulted together, and agreed that, upon a certain day, they would omit to notice the Premier's speech. The day came; Pitt delivered a great and important oration; the next morning's papers contained no record of his remarks. Highly incensed, the Premier sent for the editors, and demanded the reason of this remarkable omission. The editors referred him to the reporters. The reporters represented that they were so crowded and inconvenienced, and at such a distance from the speakers, that it was almost impossible to hear, much less to report, the speeches. The result of this novel protest was the order of the Premier that benches should be reserved for the reporters; and afterward a portion of the gallery was railed in for them, with a lattice-work in front, so that they could see and hear, but be unseen by the members. Thus the reporters, by a thoroughly British fiction, were present in, but not actually in the presence of, Parliament, and were therefore allowed to remain in spite of the old rule against them. As recently as 1849 Daniel O'Connell attempted to revive this rule, because of a pique against the *London Times*; but the effort signally failed, and usage—that chief law of England—now protects the reporters in their privileges, which are so essential to public welfare.

In this country the attendance of the reporter is cordially invited at all meetings of public bodies, and the best places are uniformly reserved for him. When the New York press first began publishing reports of the religious anniversaries in New York city, however, it had to contend with the same prejudice as that encountered by the English press, and every possible effort was made to exclude the reporters from anniversary meetings. Many of our public men also objected to the publication of reports of their speeches; some urging that they intended to deliver the same speech over and over again in different places, but were prevented by the reporters; and others resenting the reports as personal insults, because the too-faithful chroniclers recorded the speeches just as they were spoken, and not as they were intended to be uttered, before the *bon vivant* got the better of the orator, and wine transformed wisdom into nonsense, and wit into buffoonery. Both these classes of objectors have long since disappeared—although some public lecturers still request that no report shall be made of their discourses—and newspaper reports are now so accurate that they are introduced into courts of law as evidence; and only a short time ago the proceedings against a noted Philadelphia politician, upon the grave charge of treason, were

based upon a phonographic report of his speech published in a morning journal.

For a long while, however, the American reporters followed the example of Doctor Johnson, and reported no speech which they did not adorn or spoil. Daniel Webster complained bitterly of this habit, and frequently demanded that his speeches should be reported as delivered or not at all. Of all reporters, Mr. Henry J. Raymond, then connected with the *Courier* and now the chief editor of the *New York Times*, pleased Daniel Webster most. The classical quotations in which Webster indulged were always remarkably *apropos*, and he felt considerable pride in having them reported correctly. Mr. Raymond, with an equal pride in his profession, never depended upon his notes or his memory for these quotations, but took the trouble of looking them out in the books and copying them *verbatim et literatim*. In those days it was a great feat to report and publish a long speech. Upon one occasion, Webster delivered an address at Washington, and Mr. Raymond was among the reporters present. Webster concluded his remarks but a few moments before the mail closed, and the reporters were therefore unable to write out their notes for transmission to the New York papers before the next day. Mr. Raymond, however, being an exceedingly rapid writer, had taken down the speech in long hand, with only a few simple abbreviations, and observing the perplexity of the other reporters, he determined to send off his notes as they were, and trust to the compositors to decipher them. This plan was successful; the *Courier* received and published the speech in advance of its contemporaries, and its reputation for enterprise was measurably increased. The first long speech ever telegraphed in full was one delivered by Senator Calhoun, whose speeches seemed always prepared and intended for the telegraph. He was, indeed, the telegraphic orator of his day. His sentences were brief, compressed, epigrammatic, contained no superfluous words, and were so knit and welded together that not one could be omitted without destroying the entire oration. Nowadays we read—or rather we see but do not read—full reports by telegraph of all the important speeches delivered in Congress; but until 1840 the proceedings of Congress were never regularly reported for the newspapers, and were but briefly referred to in the letters of Washington correspondents. During 1840 Mr. Bennett, of the *Herald*, organized a corps of Congressional reporters for his paper, and the other journals, one after another, were gradually adopting the same system, when the introduction of telegraphic reports, in 1848, forced them all into the arrangement. The proceedings of Congress are now reported by the Associated Press; but the *Herald*, *Tribune*, and other leading papers still maintain their separate Congressional corps. Mr. Sutton, now the chief of the official reporters for the *Congressional Globe*, was also the chief of the original *Herald* corps. One of the first instances of telegraphing reports for long

distances occurred at the delivery of Clay's great speech, at Lexington, Kentucky. This speech was taken down by the *Herald* reporters, expressed by relays of horses to Cincinnati, and from thence telegraphed to New York. The report was not *verbatim*, however. The greatest reportorial feat of ante-telegraphic journalism was performed by Mr. Attree, of the *Herald*. Daniel Webster delivered a speech one afternoon at Patchogue, Long Island, some fifty or sixty miles from New York. Mr. Attree went down to Patchogue, took full notes of the speech, rode the entire distance to New York on relays of horses, wrote out his report, and published it complete in the next morning's *Herald*. For reportorial skill and physical endurance combined this achievement is unsurpassed.

The greatest recent reportorial enterprises have been the reports of the visit of the Japanese Princes, of the tour of the Prince of Wales, and of the journey of President Lincoln from Springfield to Washington. The custom of sending reporters to accompany distinguished personages was introduced by the *Herald*, in 1837, when President Van Buren's tour was fully chronicled; and this was afterward followed up by reports of President Polk's trip through the Atlantic States from North Carolina to Maine. During this latter affair a most remarkable speech was delivered by an army officer, at Trenton, New Jersey. Major S—, U.S.A., the hero referred to, had been stationed for a long time on the Western frontiers, and had there acquired, in addition to his natural candor and simplicity, the habit of speaking his mind freely, regardless of circumstances. The Major was one of President Polk's suite, and had participated in all the festivities of the tour. For some reason or other the ladies of Portland, Maine, had eclipsed all the other ladies of all the other cities in the estimation of the honest Major, whether because their white dresses were whiter, their gay ribbons gayer, and their bright eyes brighter than those of the other damsels, could never be satisfactorily determined. Arrived at Trenton, the Presidential party proceeded in procession to the State House, and sat down to a bountiful repast, the ladies looking upon the diners from the galleries around the hall. Dinner over, toasts and speeches were in order, and at last Major S— was called upon to respond to the ever-welcome and standard benison, "The ladies, God bless them!" The Major would rather have faced a flaming battery than made a speech, but in the presence of his Commander-in-Chief he considered it his duty to comply. "Gentlemen and ladies," said he, looking around the table and up at the galleries, "I have felt since I've been on this trip as if I had been drawn through two long lines of beautiful women. [Applause.] I never had an idea that there were so many angels in this wicked world. [Applause.] But I think the women of one city are more beautiful than any of the rest, and I wonder that justice has never been done to them. [Applause, and a decidedly agree-

able sensation among the ladies in the gallery.] I mean, my friends, the ladies of Portland, Maine, the handsomest women I ever saw. Gentlemen, I give you the health of the ladies of Portland, Maine!" The excitement, confusion, and roars of laughter which followed this unexpected conclusion of the Major's remarks must be left to the imagination of the reader.

Returning to our muttons, we notice that these early trips were reported exclusively by letter, while in the modern instances the telegraph played a most conspicuous part. The Prince of Wales was met at St. Johns, Newfoundland, by a *Herald* reporter, and a full account of his arrival and the attendant festivities was immediately telegraphed to New York. The reporters of the other papers awaited the Prince at Halifax, and from the time of his arrival there until he left the continent at Portland, he was always accompanied by representatives of the New York press. The *Tribune* reports were chiefly by mail, and those of the *Herald* and *Times* by both mail and telegraph. The *Herald* reports especially were unrivaled specimens of telegraphic correspondence. Every incident of travel, every speech delivered, every feature of the scenery, the decorations and details of every ball, reception, and levee were telegraphed regardless of expense. The other papers, however, kept up a generous and well-sustained rivalry, and published voluminous telegrams and letters daily, during the three months of the Prince's visit. It would be impossible for us to refer at present to any of the numerous instances of individual enterprise during this trip; but when the cost, duration, extent, and completeness of the labors of the reporters during this tour are considered, certainly the report of the Prince's visit must be admitted as unequalled in the history of the press. The Japanese Princes were met at Panama, and accompanied through the country and back to China by New York reporters. One of the *Herald* corps journeyed to Kansas with Secretary Seward, reporting all his speeches in brief by telegraph. Another *Herald* reporter rode across the plains to San Francisco in the first stage dispatched by the Overland Route. The journey of President Lincoln from Springfield to the national capital, with all the incidents, processions, and speeches, was reported for and regularly telegraphed to New York papers. In a few years more, if designs now nearly perfected can be practically carried out, the leading journals of this country will altogether discard the mails and the expresses, and receive all their news, foreign and domestic, by telegraph alone. Then will a new era of journalism dawn upon the world. The line of direct communication just completed between New York and San Francisco, and the numerous overland and submarine telegraphs in progress, or in contemplation throughout the Old World, are but means to this end. The trans-oceanic telegraph will follow soon. The first Atlantic cable was an experiment; the next will be a success. This age has not completed, but has only just begun its miracles.

We have by no means exhausted the subject of this article; but we have space left for only a mere mention of the connection of the reporters of the press with the present war. The New York *Herald* initiated the present style of war reporting during the campaign in Mexico. The London *Times*' famous report of the battle of Waterloo, received in advance of the Government dispatches, was but intelligence of the result of the battle and not a description of the combat. Our newspapers frequently rivaled this feat during the Mexican war, and, only a few months ago, the telegrams *via* New York informed the President and the War Department of the battle at Shiloh a day before the receipt of the Government reports. The news from Mexico, during Taylor and Scott's campaign, was conveyed by boat across the Gulf from Vera Cruz to New Orleans; from thence by mail to Mobile; thence by horse express to Montgomery, Alabama; thence by mail to Wilmington, Delaware; and thence by telegraph to the *Herald* office at New York. The whole journey by this route occupied about eight or ten days, and the news thus transmitted was received two days in advance of that by the through mail from New Orleans. The *Herald* had its regular correspondents with the armies in Mexico, and for some time maintained this costly line of communication exclusively; but the other papers afterward shared the expense and the news. The London papers had reporters at the Crimea during the war with Russia, but no paper ventured to send more than one representative. Several of the American journals had correspondents in the Crimea also; and during the Italian war the New York *Times* had two reporters with the French army, and established its reputation for enterprise by its admirable accounts of the great battles of that campaign.

All former war reports, however, are insignificant when compared with those published by the New York papers during this rebellion. The Associated Press does most of the telegraphic reporting; but all of our leading journals have correspondents with every division of the army and navy, East, West, and South. These reporters share the perils of the fight, and the fatigues and hardships of the march, the bivouac, or the voyage, with our soldiers and seamen. Most of them have had numerous hairbreadth escapes, and know by experience the dangers of the imminent, deadly breach. Many of them have entered the army and navy, and have shown that they can handle the sword as well as the more powerful pen; and quite a number of military and naval officers have resigned their positions and joined the reportorial corps. To these war correspondents the public is most deeply indebted. They describe every battle; faithfully chronicle every skirmish, scout, and siege; report the incidents of every march and camp; send on the names of the killed, wounded, and missing; draw and forward reliable maps of the scenes of conflict; and, in short, fully inform the people of every chance and mis-

chance, hap and mishap, fortune and misfortune, success and defeat, during the war. In spite of the restrictions of the Government censor, their criticism is generally free and just, and has done much good by exposing abuses and ridding the service of incompetent or corrupt officers. Their praise of skill, courage, and good conduct has rewarded many a hero unnoticed in official reports, encouraged the brave, stimulated the indifferent, inspired the discouraged, and brought tears of joyful pride to many a mother's eye and many a father's. Those who have husbands, sons, brothers, relatives, or friends at the wars—and who of us has not?—can not be too grateful to the press correspondents who lift the cloud of painful uncertainty from every battlefield, and reveal to them their loved ones gloriously safe or gloriously dead, wounded, or in prison. Besides their published reports these correspondents regularly supply their chief editors with facts, which prudence or the censorship withholds from the public, but upon which are based important editorial predictions of future events or censures of past or present errors. Thus the war reporters are writing the history of this war as it occurs, and supplying the materials for intelligent commentary and criticism upon contemporaneous events. Their usefulness can not be overestimated, nor can any praise be too great for their deserts.

JUMPING JACK'S DAUGHTER.

I.

IT was the morning of a bright cloudless day in June, and the soft fresh air was full of song and perfume, when Fanny Berrian, a fair and delicate girl of sixteen years, the only daughter of the Rev. Francis Berrian, the clergyman of Chester, was returning from her morning walk, and as she passed the head of Brier Lane, it looked so cool, and green, and shady, that a sudden whim prompted her to turn into it.

Brier Lane was, as its name would indicate, rather a lonely and unfrequented road; the only dwelling it could boast being a large and substantial, but rather dilapidated, old stone farmhouse which stood some distance back from the street, and was nearly hidden by a high fence and the tall neglected trees which surrounded it. The old house had been so long without a tenant that common report in the village said that it was haunted, although by whom or by what seemed rather an unsettled question, even among the most zealous propagandists of the report; but Fanny Berrian was no believer in ghosts, at least not in broad daylight, and she tripped merrily along the almost untrodden pathway without fear or misgiving.

But as Fanny reached the fence which separated what had once been a garden from the roadside, a loud, shrill "whoop," something between a bird-call and an Indian war-whoop, startled her; she looked round but saw no one; a loud burst of laughter succeeded, and then a merry young voice called out, "Hullo!"