

a blacksmith engaged in shoeing horses and repairing appliances used by the labourers in such a camp'; a man employed to attend a bar, wash bottles, unpack goods, sweep out the bar-room, and do everything that is required of him'. There is also explicit authority for the doctrine that a servant engaged to do work which is essentially manual is a "labourer," although the work may be such as cannot be performed without the exercise of special skill. In this point of view it is considered that a preference should be accorded to such employes as type-setters, cylinder-feeders, and pressmen in a printing-office'. The position has also been taken that, while a person who merely discharges the functions of an architect, to the extent of drawing the plans of a building, is not within the purview of a statute granting a lien for "work" or "labour" in respect to that building, such a statute embraces a person who not only furnishes the plans for the building but also superintends its construction'.

claimants fell under the generic description "labourers." The actual point upon which they turned was that they were engaged in a common enterprise with the men who handled the logs. They are in conflict with *McCormack v. Los Angeles Water Co.* (1870) 40 Cal. 185, where it was held that a man hired to cook for men engaged in constructing a reservoir was not entitled to a lien on it.

Breault v. Archambault (1876) 64 Minn. 420.

Lowenstein v. Myer (1901) 114 Ga. 709. The mere fact that a part of his duties was the keeping of the books was deemed not to be sufficient to exclude him from the benefit of the statute.

Heckman v. Tammen (1900) 184 Ill. 144. The court said: "To so construe the statute as to limit its benefits to mere menial servants performing the lowest forms of labour requiring no skill, would, we think, do violence to the meaning of the Act and leave the evil intended to be cured to remain in existence only slightly mitigated. While we are disposed to hold that the statute must be confined to those who perform manual services, still it cannot be confined to such services only that require no skill in the performance of them."

Bank of Pennsylvania v. Gries (1860) 35 Pa. 423. Alluding to the functions of the claimant the court said: "This is work often done by the master-mechanic, and is as essential to the due construction of a building as is the purely mechanical part. . . . A mere naked architect, and who may be such without being an operative mechanic, who draws plans in anticipation of buildings usually, to enable the builder to determine the kind he will erect, could hardly be supposed to be within the Act which provides a lien for work 'done for or about the erection or construction of the building.' But very distinguishable from this, is the case of a party employed to devote his entire time to a building, and