

secession of British Columbia, statements that "there is going to be another episode like the Boston tea party," and such wild speech will not gain much approval.

The Hon. T. Nosse, for whom Canada has a deep respect, says he is sorry that the undesirable practices of the United States have found their way across the border. But he may rest assured that the Vancouver offenders will suffer the penalty of their crimes.

There seems to be one necessary virtue lacking in British Columbia, and that is patience. The mills of legislation grind slowly. No reasonable being could expect a mandate to be forthwith issued from Ottawa or London forbidding the entry of any more Orientals. Anglo-Japanese and Canadian-Japanese relations, commercial prospects, cannot be put aside in haste, with an impatient cry. One cannot help thinking that the white labor element has been pandered to a little too much.

British Columbia and Japan are the parties chiefly concerned. But there are many important phases which affect others interested. Rioting will not hasten reform. It is likely to retard it. Whatever action is taken someone will remain dissatisfied, possibly either Japan or our own province. Patriotism will probably dictate which. But this patriotism must be tinged with diplomacy.

British Columbia is populated to an extent of only about three per cent. Therefore, the time which must elapse before proper consideration can be given to the question need not be a period of weeping and wailing for the province.

The press of the Pacific coast appear to think that the Eastern press fail to appreciate their grievances. Which is far from true. The chief complaint in this end of the country is concerning what appears to be the tendency of Vancouver, and its surroundings, to become extremely impatient in their demands, and to allow the fanatic too much limelight. The hesitancy of Eastern Canada on the subject has been due principally perhaps to the fact that, not being intimately and immediately concerned, it has taken a broader and an international view of this serious problem, an attitude British Columbia might do well to emulate. At heart, that province has the sympathy of the Dominion. But there is not the slightest necessity for rushing along blindly, waving red flags, indulging in riots, and talking of meeting Japanese immigrant ships with guns. The mayor of Vancouver, too, is ill-advised in supporting an inane proposal to send five hundred Orientals to Ottawa with the object of impressing the gravity of the situation upon the authorities. No such impressions are needed. And it is making a fool of the Oriental.

If colored labor is excluded, the prosperity of the province must suffer. While not agreeing with an irresponsible and illimitable influx into Canada of Oriental labor, the development of this Pacific coast country is of vast importance, almost of primary importance. If one of the chief supplies of labor is curtailed or stopped altogether, the industrial effect will be serious.

Relief should be afforded by the direction of European emigration to British Columbia. The three prairie provinces are absorbing the majority of what is considered desirable labor. This is due to two reasons. Firstly, because the wheat lands of the Dominion are most advertised, and most talked of by the prospective emigrant. Secondly, because it costs him almost double as much to reach the Pacific coast as it does to get to Manitoba, Alberta, or Saskatchewan. This phase is a matter for official attention. British Columbia should not suffer from the fact that it is farther removed from Europe than its sister provinces.

Summing up, we would say: stop rioting, with the utmost vigor. Develop the province with available labor. Discuss the Oriental problem, fully and impassionately; afterwards, action. And take steps for an increased influx of British and European labor to British Columbia particularly.

WAITING TO KNOW.

The sympathy with the relatives of those who lost their lives in the Québec bridge disaster is world-wide. At such times, our first thoughts are for human sufferers. Then comes a wave of indignation, guesses concerning responsibility, and more important than either of these two, an official enquiry. Not since the collapse of the Tay bridge in Scotland, in 1879, has there been such a similar catastrophe.

The layman naturally views the disaster, broadly speaking, from a different viewpoint to that of the engineer. Although the average engineer is blessed with commonsense, he sometimes allows business ethics to be lost in an atmosphere of technical aspirations. We do not imply that engineers, as a body, are more concerned with a dossier of blue prints, statistics and ambitious achievements on paper, rather than practical undertakings, but it has happened more than once, in this age of the record-breaking craze, that catastrophes have occurred because one body wanted to show some bigger feat than his neighbor's.

To say that some one has blundered is an obvious observation. That some one will have to pay pretty dearly for that blunder is a fair assumption. For several weeks we shall be treated to evidence, commonly labelled sensational, regarding real and alleged defects in the construction of this immense structure. Already there has been shown, as is usual after the event, much knowledge of things that ought not to have been.

It is an easy task to assume the role of an armchair critic. But such critics are more useful than is generally supposed. The onlooker frequently obtains the best view of things passing. It may be a hard thing to say that such an engineering collapse should not have occurred. The men responsible for the construction of the bridge will probably tell us that we might as well talk of preventing a thunderstorm. But there is one very good reason for thinking that the arm which lies wrecked in the waters of the St. Lawrence, might be still poised above the river.

The bridge is admittedly an experiment, if only for the fact that it is to include a single span of eighteen hundred feet. This means that extraordinary precautions and care should have been taken in every foot of work. Where, in an ordinary engineering undertaking, calculations are checked and tested twice, in this instance they should have been checked double that. Where, in an everyday enterprise, the practicability of theories is proved by a few tests, a dozen tests should have been made in the case of the Quebec bridge. This may appear the views of him whose time has been spent in reading literature other than engineering manuals. But the basic facts remain.

We know that almost anything is possible to the engineer. If not in reality, in print. No one in these days of scientific progress would be foolish enough to draw a line and say to the engineer, "Thus far shalt thou go, and no farther." The past century has proved what remarkable progressive steps science and engineering can take in a hundred years. Decade after decade has tended to show that we are again and again on the threshold of a bigger scientific world. Therefore, it would serve no purpose to say that a single span of eighteen hundred feet in the Quebec bridge cannot be built with safety. But whether it is necessary to build a single span of such a length is a point which will occur to many. Would two spans of nine hundred feet each serve the purposes for which the bridge is built, equally as well? We do not say so, but the question will arise in the minds of more than one person who thanks Providence that a small portion of the bridge lies in the river rather than the whole structure, coupled perhaps with a still more appalling loss of life than has occurred. We do not desire the Quebec bridge to be a monument of engineering glory and honor. We need a structure of which strength and safety are the first virtues.