

tower speaks of war and strife; and the nearer we approach to that form of building, the less is the air of homeliness. To build a homelike house we must have the home feeling strong within us. It is no good to study old houses merely as pieces of architecture, sketching a corner here, or measuring a moulding there, and reproducing them more or less correctly. We must study the soul of the building as well as the body; indeed, it is the more important study of the two. Let us once grasp the spirit of the old houses, and we may express it in any outward form we please.

And, now, having settled in our minds the ideal home, let us see how we should proceed to realize it. We will begin with the obstacles. First, the person for whom the house is to be built may be presumed to have no sympathy with our ideal; his wish is solely to provide a covering for himself and family which shall be convenient and economical. He will no doubt say, as so many do, that he is going to live inside his house and not outside; he will also have various ideas as to the disposition of certain rooms and other matters of detail. As to these last, it is important to note any strongly-marked individuality and, if it is at all possible, to emphasise it and let it appear in the house. We will, then, suppose that you have been able to show him that a home must be more than four walls and a roof, and brought him into full sympathy with yourself. It is important to do all this, but everyone must do it in his own way; no one can lay down rules for the guidance of another. Then we must see the place where it is proposed to build the house, and if we don't grasp it at once we must go again and again till we do. It is generally while we are looking at the site for the house, its prospect and aspect, the slope of the land, the positions of trees, roads and neighbouring meadows, that a half-formed idea of the kind of house that would fit this spot floats into our minds; it is, of course, very vague and shadowy, but it is sufficient to turn our minds in a certain direction. Having got a motive our next step is to work it out, quite roughly at first. Above all things we should avoid looking on a house as consisting of two parts—plans and elevations. The outside and inside must be considered absolutely as one, and it should be impossible for us to say that the outside suggested the inside, or the inside the outside. We should now let our rough studies simmer a little, and then go more seriously to work. The actual drawings should be looked upon merely as diagrams, and we must avoid being led into the mistake of supposing that things which look well when well drawn will also look well in solid materials; everything should be thought of as built before we draw it, and if we have thoroughly made up our minds that this is what we are going to do let us then draw it as well as possible. Drawing carefully will make us think carefully.

And now as to the general character of the house. Home means, as I have said before, rest, quiet, and simplicity. Our house must, therefore, be restful, quiet and simple. It does not matter how small it is, it can always be treated in a broad and simple manner, and have a quiet dignity of its own. A glance at any country cottage is sufficient to convince us of this. I don't mean to say that a house must necessarily be bare and simple in every part, but simplicity must be the keynote. Certain parts, both inside and out, can of course be elaborately treated; but it must seem natural and not an isolated piece of work, and the reason for the elaboration must be apparent. It must, too, be borne in mind (although it sounds paradoxical) that elaboration to be effective must be simple, at any rate, in its main lines. Another danger to be avoided is the deliberate planning of odd nooks and corners; let them come if they will naturally, like they did in old

houses, and they will be very charming; but where they are purposely and consciously planned, they always destroy the repose of the house, and make one feel that it required an effort to produce them. I am not saying anything about the convenient arrangement of the house; it goes without saying that a house must be convenient, but mere convenience is not sufficient. We must do much more for our house than that. It is unfortunate perhaps that the elaborate way in which we live nowadays demands a more complicated plan, and a greater subdivision of the house into various departments, than formerly. Absolute privacy, when required, is undoubtedly necessary, and is in fact one of the charms of home; but it is a question whether we do not lose a great deal of picturesqueness by so entirely shutting off the working part of the house as we do. The furnishing of the home should not be left to chance. We must contrive to arrange this as well as the house; the homelike character of rooms can very soon be destroyed. The garden, too, must be planned and schemed it is as much a part of the home as the house itself.

In conclusion, I should like to emphasise a few of the remarks I have made previously, especially those bearing upon the home feeling. Unless we have this very strongly, it seems to me that it is impossible to give a house any life at all. Let us study old houses, not as inanimate buildings of more or less architectural beauty, but as expressing the most valuable and beautiful of human sentiments—the love of home. Nowadays, when all religions are assailed, and we believe in nothing very strongly, it is almost impossible to make our churches express anything more than a sort of galvanized enthusiasm; we reproduce old forms as symbolical of certain legends, although we are not quite sure whether we believe them or not (I am only speaking generally, of course, as there are still many who believe strongly, and whose buildings express this belief very clearly.) Belief in the sacredness of home-life, however, is still left to us, and is itself a religion, pure and easy to believe. It requires no elaborate creeds, its worship is the simplest, its discipline the gentlest and its rewards are peace and contentment.

SAFETY IN OCEAN TRAVELLING.

At the present time, when we hear so much about swift ocean travelling, and when proposals are being made to still further increase the speed of steamers, it is well to consider the question from the side of safety, so that the public may form some idea of the probability of increased danger, which is usually supposed to accompany increased speed. Few persons would be inclined to shorten an ocean voyage if they ran a great risk of suddenly ending their days by so doing. Therefore a glance at the past history of the subject may be interesting. From the time of the inauguration of Atlantic Ocean transit in 1838, until 1879, 144 steamers of all classes were lost in that trade. Some of these, however, were not very important. The first which was lost was the "President," which disappeared mysteriously in 1841. It is a somewhat noteworthy fact that during the next thirteen years only one life was lost through the loss of an Atlantic steamer, and that was in the "Columbia," of the Cunard Line, which went ashore in 1843. From 1854 the losses became very frequent, and are probably to be accounted for by the change which was being made from sailing vessels to steamers, and the want of experience, not only of the officers in charge, but also of the shipbuilders and engineers who were responsible for the construction of the ships and engines. In 1854 the