

present at the dinner, as much is to be gained by such social gatherings. In any case, the members will render much assistance by letting the Secretary know whether they will be able to attend or not, as definite arrangements must be made in relation to the number who will be present. Let no one stay away because he may consider that his absence will not be noticed. In numbers there is enthusiasm, and in enthusiasm there is energy.

ONE of the most peculiar of the many strikes on the part of workmen in the building trades in Toronto, is at present in progress. The stonecutters in the employ of R. Snarr & Co., recently quit work owing to alleged unfair treatment accorded to them by Mr. Hobson, the foreman, whose dismissal they demanded. This Mr. Snarr refused on the ground that Mr. Hobson was admitted a partner in the business at the beginning of the year. Partnership articles were produced in proof of this statement. The workmen had not been aware of Mr. Hobson's relationship to the firm, and it was expected that when the situation was explained to them, they would withdraw from the position they had assumed. Not so, however. They refused to believe that the partnership was anything more than a hastily concocted scheme to deceive them, and took the more advanced ground that whether he was a partner or not, Mr. Hobson must be sent about his business. Strange to say, this most unreasonable demand was endorsed by the Stonecutters' Union, and by the Bricklayers', Plasterers', and Laborers' Unions, the members of which have all combined in refusing to work upon any building where stone from Snarr & Co.'s yards is used. As the firm thus boycotted have hitherto supplied a large proportion of the cut stone used in buildings in this city, great inconvenience and loss will be inflicted upon a large number of persons who had no connection whatever with the matters in dispute. We understand that Messrs. Snarr & Co. have determined at whatever cost to fight the unreasonable demands of the labor unions. That they are justified in so doing there can be no question, and we trust that they will receive the sympathy and assistance of every man who believes that reason and fair-play should actuate the conduct of men, whether employers or employees.

It would be amusing under other circumstances, to observe the way in which the master builders, when some trouble of this kind confronts them, seek to hurriedly whip their organization into working order. Their success is not always what they could desire, and no wonder. "In time of peace prepare for war," is a wise policy, but one which the master builders appear to have systematically disregarded. In time of peace they have acted on the go-as-you-please, every-man-for-himself plan. In time of war, as in the present instance, they perceive how helpless they are individually, and try to unite their scattered forces. How much wiser it would be to institute and maintain constantly, as do the labor unions, a perfect organization, equipped by strength of numbers as well as financially to defend successfully their rights. The labor unions have never before to our knowledge gone so far as to demand the disruption of a business partnership under threat of a boycott. Emboldened by the concessions granted to them from time to time by the employers, they are becoming more and more unreasonable and arbitrary in their demands, and unless a severe check is shortly administered to them, the term "master builder" will no longer serve to designate the employer in the building trades. It is abundantly clear that the unions do not propose to be satisfied with what men of reasonable judgment would regard as their just due, but intend to work on the principle of getting all they can, without stopping to consider whether the employer has any rights which ought to be considered. Owing to lack of proper organization on the part of the employers, their efforts along this line have so far proved fairly successful, and we may add that they are pretty certain to do so, until such time as the employers are prepared with a firmer hand to resist their unjust claims. We have repeatedly urged organization with this object, but without success. The signs of the times all

point to the fact, however, that if the employers are not to become the victims of a most galling tyranny, they must speedily take such action as will enable them to hold their own in the constantly recurring conflicts with organized labor.

IT is a matter of surprise and disappointment to us that we have received drawings from only two persons in connection with the competition for a serving pantry announced in our issues of September and October, and neither of them is good enough to illustrate. One design has many good points, but is defective in other respects, and does not fairly represent the average work in serving pantries in our better houses. The sink is shown enclosed, which is never done in any house erected under the direction of a capable or well-informed architect. The other design has apparently been prepared by a designer of furniture, and misses the mark entirely. One would judge from the design submitted that a serving pantry answered no good purpose except to afford a means of decorating the walls with cabinet work. A serving pantry should above all things serve its purpose, and there should not be the least amount of elaboration. A pantry should easily be kept clean, and that cannot be done where there are a lot of small and useless mouldings and unnecessary fixings. The series of competitions of which this one was the first, were largely instituted for the purpose of stimulating effort on the part of architectural students. It was thought that students would be quick to embrace the opportunity of measuring their ability by a comparison of work with a number of others in the same field. Accordingly the prizes were made nominal, being offered rather for the purpose of giving definiteness to the competition, than as a reward of effort. A sufficient, as well as the highest reward in such a competition, is that which comes from putting forth one's very best efforts to excel. It is far from being creditable to the architectural students of Canada that not one of them appears to have regarded the matter in this light. If their apathy towards this competition designed to encourage them to make progress in their studies, is an index of their interest in the profession, we must confess we have fears for the future of architecture in this country. If they do not propose to work, why have they entered a profession which requires work of its members beyond the capabilities of the most able? Do they propose to depend upon their ability to make a living by means of scheming, trickery, humbug and dishonesty, rather than by good, straightforward, honest effort? If they do, the sooner something is done to force them to change their methods the better. Occasionally architects are blamed because some of their members make no effort whatever to meet the ordinary requirements of civilization. Is it any wonder, when the students and afterwards architects in name only, care not whether they are competent or incompetent so long as they are able to squeeze out of this world an existence by honest or dishonest means? Two years ago the draughtsmen of Toronto formed an Association and held weekly meetings. Success attended the movement for a time, but when two or three of the active members graduated into the ranks of the profession, it went down and down, until to-day it is out of sight in the darkness of the total indifference of the draughtsmen of the present time to all information requiring effort and hard, persistent work. It is time that the students should do something to aid themselves, and likewise time that architects made an effort to get their students to semi-occasionally open a book and gain some knowledge from its pages. We take this opportunity to announce that if the next two or three competitions of the series arranged for, are no more successful than this one has been, we will discontinue them. We regret that the report of the Committee appointed to judge this competition has not yet been received. It will appear in our December issue.

A suspected joint in a sewer or drain pipe may be tested by wrapping it with a single layer of white muslin, moistened with a solution of acetate of lead. As the gas escapes through the meshes of the cloth, it will be blackened by the sulphur compounds.