represent your party. You are sent to represent Canada. A prominent member of the House is reported (we trust falsely) to have said to his fellow-members at the close of a meeting: "Gentlemen, the Conservative party has nothing to fear from this question" (the everlasting school question). It is not, Canada has nothing to fear, but the party has nothing to fear. "When all were for the party, and none were for the State," seems to be the travesty of Macaulay's lines just now. There will be a day of bitter reckoning for all of this. You are making history, and the five years subsequent to Sir John Macdonald's death will be pointed at as showing the contrast when a superior man dies and inferior men succeed him. When Alexander the Great died his generals squabbled among theniselves for a division of the spoils, and something similar has happened on a small scale in Canada. The second-rate men all thought they were able to lead, and the result has been an appeal by some of them to factional, by others to race, by others to creed, passions, in hope of strengthening their own claims. The Opposition has, on the whole, been forbearing; but neither side has during the last two sessions and the present one placed Canada before party. How long is it going to last? and where shall Canada land?

The Architects' Bill.

THE bill which is now before the Ontario Legislature to attach to the title architect an educational qualification seems to commend itself as the best means of establishing the safe construction of the new types of buildings that are now making their appearance in this country. And from this point of view perhaps the bill will be most considered by legislators and the public. A collapse of a great building is an easily recognized calamity, and to have the possibility of even one such in a generation hanging over a city is a new horror to add to the many chances of comprehensive ruin that underlie life in populous places.

But there are other evils which unskilled architects bring to us, and which, though less recognized, result in their accumulation even to greater loss of life and happiness. Nor is it only in large towns that we are at the mercy of the unscientific architect. The rural designer has often, in sanitary matters, a more difficult problem than that presented to the city architect, and one for which he is thrown usually upon his own inventive resources. Indeed, it is not only in the town, but in the country, that the insistence of a standard of training among architects will be felt to be a gain, and not so much in the large works of the towns as in the smaller works and in the general run of habitation and commercial building. The safety of life and property is the province of the legislator, and the bill will probably receive consideration chiefly on this ground; but the legislator might rightly also consider the pockets of investors in building property who have not at present the certainty they would like to have that money spent in building is a scientific investment; that when they hand over to the architect who spends their money a schedule of their wants he can fulfil them with exactness in a building.

But there is another point of view from which it seems well that education should be pressed upon the rising architect. Whatever may be said about the need that an architect should be a good constructor, a good deviser of sanitation, a good and trustworthy business man, there is another side from which he must be regarded; the only side from which in fifty years from now, our present buildings will be considered. An architect is, before all things, a maker of works of beauty. His reputation will live if he fulfils, and only if he

fulfils, that condition—which is to say that his works add or do not add to the value of the soil on which they are built chiefly on that condition.

Now, where are our young men to learn how to make their buildings works of art except from books? If we were in an old country, where a man cannot step out of doors without running against a standard example of architecture, observation might suffice; but our conditions distinctly point out the necessity of study. If the young architect is born an artist, he needs culture; for art is terribly long, even to the gifted. If he has not the innate bent to what is right, he can still acquire a knowledge of it and be pleasing. This side of the question cannot be estimated too highly, though it is likely to receive the least consideration. But though there is sometimes a tendency among business men to make light of art as a factor in the well-being of a nation, it is a tendency to be deplored, and one which we should all strive to check and suppress.

We hope that the public-spirited architects who have devoted so much time and attention to the bill now before the Local House will meet with complete success in their laudable efforts.

The Arbitration Movement.

S an Englishman who has found a pleasant home and a congenial sphere of usefulness in Canada, I have been very much interested in the discussion which has been carried on in The Week on the question of the relationship of Britain and the United States. When I was at home I was, on the whole, a follower of Mr. Gladstone, an advocate, in my own small sphere, of some fair measure of self-government for Ireland, and an admirer of the United States and many of its institutions. I have had the opportunity of denouncing "Jingoism" in the pulpit and the platform in England, and have used it. A change of position, however, is sometimes good for one, and while I still think that all foolish bluster and noisy brag-for that is what I understand as Jingoism-is to be avoided, when we come to dwell in some part of "Greater Britain" beyond the seas one is led to hope for a real "Imperial policy" which shall bind together the great English-speaking communities of the world. When the first article appeared, "Delenda est Carthago," I thought that you had worked yourself up into a feverish state of excitement about nothing. I knew, of course, that there were many Irishmen and others in the United States who cherished a strong feeling of hostility to England; but I thought that if they were, if not une quantité negligeable, at any rate, a small number out of the more than 60,000,000 inhabitants of the great Republic. I am sorry to be convinced that you had more real grounds than I believed at the time, and that "Delenda est Fudge" does not altogether solve the problem. Having lived in England nearly all my life, and having resided in many parts of it, I know that there is among ordinary people no bitter feeling against the United States and The self-restraint of the country under the provocations of President Cleveland's message is a sufficient proof of this. A war with the United States is looked upon not only as a calamity, but as nothing short of a crime; and I do not think, even after the events of the last three months, that the English people realize the extent of the hostile feeling that was stirred up against them in the neighbouring Republic. It would be unfair, however, in this connection, not to acknowledge the brave, noble words spoken by Christian ministers and others when the storm of passion was raging most loudly. There is also a good sign in the cry for arbitration which is making itself heard both in England and America. Surely the time has come when civilized Christian nations should be able to settle their grievances without letting loose the dogs of war. But is it not well to remember that arbitration has its limita-Arbitrators may give fair decisions on questions that come within the range of international law, but you cannot arbitrate out of existence a deep-seated unreasoning hatred. There must be a large amount of mutual confidence to make arbitration possible and reasonable. Then the decisions of acceptable arbitrators should be carried out loyally and promptly. An honourable nation cannot, so long as she has any strength, accept arbitration at the point of the bayonet. If the American people are enthusiastic for arbitration, the