

advantages, the movement, for want of vigorous agitation, has made no decided progress.

Proprietors of newspapers, editors, and reporters are busy men, and their time is so much taken up in agitating reforms for others that self-interest is neglected, so that what might, by a little attention, be made of the greatest benefit to themselves, is entirely overlooked. They should remember, however, that "charity begins at home," and pause occasionally in their self-sacrificing labors to look after number one.

Nearly all the States in the American Union, and most of the Provinces of our Dominion, have their Press Associations, and it does not speak well for the enterprise of our newspaper men, that at this late day they have no similar organization. New Brunswick has a flourishing Press Association, and we should for once consent to follow where we generally boast that we lead, and without further delay form an Association in this Province. Outside of the advantages that would accrue from the meeting together of the workers in the journalistic field, and the feelings of good-fellowship engendered, the Association could be made mutually beneficial in many ways. From a purely business standpoint, the Association is necessary. Editors are also often proprietors, and if not, they, as well as reporters, are interested, or should be, in the financial success of the journals with which they are connected. Advertising is one of the most profitable sources of revenue, and yet, for want of some definite understanding, the numerous journals in the Province are continually taking work at unprofitable rates, because unscrupulous advertisers assert that other journals are doing the same. Were a Press Association in existence, a uniform rate, proportionate to the circulation and influence of each journal, might be agreed upon, and the members pledged not to deviate from it. This would prove mutually advantageous to press and public, and would place advertising upon a sound business basis. Arrangements could also be made for the collection and transmission of news, for special travelling and hotel rates, and other advantages "too numerous to mention." At present our press is open to the charge of want of hospitality. Associations from abroad often visit us, and who is there to receive them? In such cases individuals come nobly to the rescue, but most newspaper-men are not troubled with superfluous wealth, and these self-sacrificing individuals have often to do the honors at too great a strain upon their pockets. With a Press Association in existence, there would always be a reception committee, and an expense, burdensome to individuals, would not be felt when divided amongst its members. Those members of the press who have been hospitably entertained by Press Associations abroad will acknowledge the force of this argument.

The Press is the greatest power in the land, and if its members will only unite and form an Association, they will be surprised in how many ways they may enjoy the "sweets of power."

We have touched only upon a few of the benefits that might be derived from the formation of a Press Association, trusting that the press throughout the Province will join us in the agitation, and keep it up, until the Nova Scotia Press Association has been organized.

### THE IRISH QUESTION.

It can scarcely be doubted that the visit of Sir Thos. Esmonde to this country in the interests of Home Rule has been of a much more acceptable nature to Canadians of all shades of opinion than the mission of Mr. Wm. O'Brien. We say "of all shades of opinion" advisedly, because we think there are scarcely any citizens of the Dominion who do not believe that Home Rule is a necessity for the pacification of Ireland; a measure of justice to an intense national feeling, and of urgency in the general interests of the United Kingdom.

Any details of the scope of the measure are beyond our present purpose, as is also any minute discussion of the reasons or the means by which the strength of Irish sentiment has been evoked. It is sufficient that its depth and force are great existing facts, and are the facts that the statesmanship of the United Kingdom has to face, to grapple with, and to satisfy.

The subject, treated at least with any degree of truth or impartiality, is systematically evaded by the political press of Canada, for considerations sufficiently obvious, but the motives which control it have no deterrent influence with independent journals. These are free to give due weight to the universal axiom that every question has two sides, and to place the most important questions, so far as lies in them, impartially before their readers.

The public, it might be inferred, is careless enough about truth, or it would scarcely be satisfied with the one-sided reports which alone find their way into the columns of the general press, and which systematically exaggerate and pervert the acts of the British Government. Without any animus we will briefly point out a few instances in which public opinion is persistently misled.

In the first place, the Crimes Act is denounced as the acme of tyranny, and as aimed at the suppression of all expression of popular opinion. As a simple matter of fact, it is far less severe than Mr. Gladstone's Act, which enabled him to imprison without trial, and its real purpose is to vindicate the supremacy of law as against the organized crime of the secret societies, which constitute a social tyranny only paralleled by the Vehmgericht of the middle ages. No detail of the kind of crime fostered, enjoined, and practiced is here necessary, though probably nine-tenths of Canada is ignorant of its nature and extent. However a law made with the purpose of vindicating the supremacy of law may be carried out, there is right and justice in the principle; and we know enough to be sure that, when the administration of it is stigmatised as brutal savagery which, as regards the carrying out of prison discipline in Irish jails, finds no parallel in the history of any

civilized nation, we are reading rhetorical exaggeration of a very marked type.

It is unnecessary to express any opinion as to imputations of the complicity of the League with crime and boycotting—the former of the more truculent description, the latter the most flagrant illegal violation of the liberty of the subject. It is enough to believe that to the higher type of Irishmen they must be as revolting as to any other civilized man, and we have before expressed our opinion that if violence and outrage were put a stop to, Home Rule would have two friends where it has now but one.

When Sir Thos. Esmonde jocosely assures us that he never shot a man from behind a hedge, or mutilated an ox, we have no difficulty in understanding that his disclaimer, though a pleasantry as regards himself, has a serious meaning as regards many of his co-nationalists, neither have we any difficulty in believing it.

In other respects we may well hope that the moderation with which that gentleman enforces his views is significant of a like modification throughout the party, of which, indeed, we think some signs—due, perhaps, to the large access of English sympathy—are discernible.

When Sir Thomas assures us that in an Irish Parliament the rights of the Protestant minority would be safe, we are justified in giving full weight to the utterance of a competent representative of his party, and his statement of what he owed to his Protestant supporters is very significant.

There are other points to which we have not space to refer, but above all narrower considerations stands the overwhelming fact that, whatever conservative Englishmen may think of it, the government of a free people by means repugnant to its deepest feelings cannot but be a grievous error. Loyalty and good-will cannot, in the nature of man, be expected, where men are governed against their will and against their instincts. It is no good to say it is for their good—facts and results contradict the assumption. On this broad ground, we think coercion so grave a mistake, that we believe the Conservative Government will, on account of it, be unable to long sustain their tenure of power.

It has long been matter of surprise to us that English statesmen have continued blind to the peculiarly obnoxious nature of the Castle Government. Involving, as it does, the anomaly of a rule practically independent of Parliament, while Irish members sit there, it is little to be wondered at that the Irish people regard it with disgust. Logically, Ireland should hitherto have been governed from London, and whenever there is an Irish Parliament, a Viceroy would be far more in place and keeping than now.

But for the Phoenix Park murders in the first place, and Mr. Gladstone's precipitancy in the second, the question would, no doubt, have been settled ere this. As it is, we are of opinion that another year or two will see the Imperial Parliament disembarrassed of a mass of affairs which does not rightly appertain to it, by measures of Home Rule, not only for Ireland, but for Scotland, if not Wales also.

The rapid reduction of rents, both by voluntary concessions and by the operations of the Land Courts, also seems to us to be fast paving the way for a Land Purchase Bill, which, whatever it may cost, would at least relieve the country from the necessity of keeping up in Ireland 27,000 troops, with the numberless exasperations attendant on a coercive régime.

### PHYSICAL EDUCATION—HOW AND BY WHOM SHALL IT BE CONDUCTED?

As the question of regular physical exercise for the pupils of our city schools appears to be receiving considerable attention from those who control our educational institutions, and as some definite plan will probably be decided upon before long, a public discussion of the matter is just now in place. It is felt that the efforts already made to develop the *physique* of the young people in our schools have not been sufficiently far reaching. The afternoon classes held in the Academy are not so generally attended as the importance of physical training renders desirable.

A proposition was made at the last meeting of the School Board to appoint a regular teacher of calisthenics at a fixed annual salary. Now, while the benefits resulting from such a course ought amply to justify the expenditure, we are of the opinion that even better results can be obtained for less money. There are in the city schools 106 teachers, with an average of about fifty pupils each. That is to say, the instructor of calisthenics would have 106 classes per week, or twenty-one each day, even if each pupil had a lesson only once a week. Now, this would give only a poor quarter-hour at the most for the weekly physical training of each pupil.

If the work is worth doing, it is worth doing well. No half-way measures should be taken in a matter which concerns the physical, and in a great measure the moral, well-being of the race. Physical training should have a place in the regular curriculum of our schools. After-hours only a small proportion of the pupils can be expected to attend. What if other subjects are made to suffer? By a sort of sliding time-table, this additional subject might be placed on different days in different weeks, so that the loss would be borne by several subjects equally.

Here the question naturally suggests itself, who shall conduct the calisthenic classes? To this the answer is not far to seek. Only the regular teachers can give this branch of early training sufficient attention—unless, indeed, the public are willing to pay, not one instructor, but four or five. Let all the teachers be instructed in such calisthenic exercises as are suitable for the age of their own pupils, according to the recommendations of the best authorities on physical culture; let at least two lessons of half-an-hour each be given weekly in each class during the regular school hours; let a regular system of physical training be drawn up and prescribed—and we have the work done more cheaply and, we believe, much more efficiently than by the appointment of a single instructor, however good.