

the rule for their gun and the note-book for their game-bag.

We believe (say the first) in training hand and eye, and in sketching as the best means to that end. In the study of mass, effect, essentials and in schooling ourselves to take a large view of things. We believe, moreover, in precedent, in so far only as it stimulates but does not fetter us in the designing of original work.

We believe (say the second) in drawing only as a means of study. In exact and careful study of details first and through these afterwards of mass. In drawing what will be most useful to us in our practice, and that in such a form as will be most handy for reference. We believe in upholding tradition, that new tradition may have legitimate birth.

Each of these seems so reasonable that one is inclined to ask, "Why all this pother? What is there in either that is antagonistic to the other? Why not mingle banners and join forces, and so march shoulder to shoulder? Why, indeed! Yet the points of difference are quickly shown by what each think of the others.

The first hold that the trained eye will ever guide the trained hand aright in the tracing of true proportions and fitting forms, even down to the minutest details in original design, and cry out upon the second for a slavish adherence to traditional detail, taunting them with utter helplessness when away from their note-books. The second retort that their rivals' method of study get them no knowledge of architecture, but only of drawing, and hold up their own well-filled note-books as but a type of their well-stored minds. Put mind into your work, say the first—beauty, say the second.

To an unprejudiced eye (that is one which looks for faults in each), broadly, the first school oftenest seems to fail in beauty of detail—just as you might expect—and the second in largeness of idea. It would not do to quote instances, nor is it necessary, for they are easy to recognize and will readily suggest themselves. It is true that we must all have our failings, but should we not try to counteract them?—and there would be nothing to be said if our men of large ideas were found sketching a little more than they do for the sake of detail; and vice versa our cunning inventors of beautiful detail sketching more for the sake of receiving impressions.

The latter, on the whole, have just now, I think, the louder voice and the larger following. The louder voice because matured generally by years, and settled into a commanding basso that rings of authority and circumstance; and it might ring and welcome but that it is apt to find too ready an echo from voices that have not lost their youthful treble.

It is surely impossible for a man who claims to have a sense of justice to argue himself to a conclusion in favor of either of these two methods. There is so much to say for each. It is just conceivable that those who have begun life in one camp may find that as years have grown on them with gray hairs and light-and-air cases they have gradually moved over to the opposite camp—there perhaps to stop. But from which and to which camp this migration is likely to have taken place I pray to be excused from saying. It would be hard to tell, and the more the question were looked at so the more it would be hard to tell.

It is just as likely, but for the fleeting fashion of the

time, to have been the one as the other. Now, who of us old men are ever really ashamed of the follies of our youth? Or who of us young men but could (did we stop to think) look forward with some complacency to a total change of ideals when age shall have come upon us? If one camp may have been associated with our earlier and the other with our later years, who is to say which was wrong and which right? That one may have come last as a development from the other is surely no more an argument in favor of that one than that it may have come first, when the mind was pure, fresh and receptive, is an argument for the other.

Did we stop to think, that hits it, for old and young alike, for sketchers and measurers, for perspective men and collectors of detail, for impressionists and academics. Did we stop to think we might use the time we waste and the energy in inveighing against the opposite camp, to further the interests of our own. For both are serving under the same queen, and there is no reason why an exchange of civilities might not take the place of an exchange of invectives. A day's hunting as guest to one camp would come amiss to no member of the other. In golf, when you have become "stale" in the use of your "driver," you play for a day or two with your "cleek."

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

A SUBSCRIBER at Chatham, Ont., writes: "Please inform me to whom should belong the responsibility for the care of stone after it is put in the building—the party who furnishes the stone, or the bricklayer. In the event of the stone getting chipped by bricks falling on it, or being splashed with mortar, who should be held responsible?"

ANSWER.—The question of responsibility for the care of materials placed in a building is usually covered by a clause in the contracts, and in case the question arises as to where the responsibility for damage belongs, the matter is usually decided by the architect. Where a person enters into a contract to supply stone or any other material for a building, which is to be placed in position by other contractors, his responsibility ends when the material is laid down in good condition at the building. In case the contractor agrees to furnish the material and place it in position in the building, he is held responsible for its protection from damage until the completion of the building, and is expected to take all reasonable precautions to guard it from damage. If, after such precautions have been taken, it should be damaged through the negligence of a contractor for one of the other trades, we imagine that there can be no question that the person guilty of such negligence would be held accountable for whatever injury might result.

The McEachren Heating and Ventilating Company, of Galt, Ont., report an increasing demand for their improved dry kilns, having recently received orders from the following: Densmore & Crowe, Lower Stewicke, N. S.; J. and D. A. Harguail, Campbellton, N. B.; Dyment, Baker Lumber Co., London; Laking, Thomson, Patterson & Co., Hamilton; M. Brennen & Sons, Hamilton; Dowswell Bros., Ltd., Hamilton; Mechanics Manufacturing Co., Summerside, P. E. I., and J. and P. Nadeau, Grand Cascedia, Que. It is claimed that these kilns will dry green elm, ash, whitewood, etc., in from six to eight days, of ten hours each, without checking, warping or case-hardening, using only exhaust steam. The McEachren Co. also make a full line of ventilating, shavings and electric fans, blowers, exhausters, etc.