

not be the most direct way for building owners to proceed in all cases; whether it would not be better to make the contractor the responsible person, not the architect. Both functions are necessary; but, if the contractor cannot design himself, he can employ an architect. Would the owner be any the worse for this change of relation between the architect and contractor? Would he not be the better by the disappearance of the uncertainty that now sometimes attends the ultimate price of a building? Why should not buildings be built to order, just as clothes are made to order, for a fixed price? A reputable tailor does not fail us in respect of either design, material or workmanship. It is understood that these qualities are to be assured to us at a fixed price, and the tailor's reputation depends upon the faithful fulfilment of the understanding. Why then cannot a reputable builder be trusted to provide us a building to order upon the same terms? A builder's reputation depends upon his work as much as a tailor's! That is true; but does he depend so much upon his reputation? A tailor's unit of production is small, and its period of duration is short however well it is made. A tailor has to make many many coats before he can make a fortune. Patient continuance in well doing is his only hope for this world as well as for the next. But the contractor!—One good contract scientifically scamped will easily yield a fortune, and the result need not show too soon. What is reputation to a man who can make a fortune before he is found out? Wealth—I speak as a man—is the best reputation. The case of the tailor is not an illustration in point. It is but an illustration of the danger of reasoning from analogy.

The architect is then a commercial necessity, to fix and keep up a good standard of work which, were he not the responsible arbiter, would speedily dwindle. Nor would the architect himself, in these conditions, have the stimulus an artist needs.

The Toronto Plumbers' Strike.

The plumbers of Toronto entered into a wage agreement in 1900, which, according to the conditions of the agreement, is "to stay in force until the first day of January, 1904. And should either party to this agreement wish to change, add to or amend the above, they shall give a least three months' notice in writing prior to the termination of this agreement." The men, after a year of the agreement, have struck for an increase of wages after giving three months notice, and say that this is their interpretation of the above clause. The implication that to express a desire for the termination of an agreement upon a certain date is the same thing as procuring its termination on that date is—considering that the consent of the other party to the agreement is necessary for such termination—a piece of presumption which may be warranted by previous occurrences of the kind; but the only sort of previous occurrence of any kind, that will avail to give this interpretation weight in law, is a judge's decision that the date of the termination of an agreement, which has been fixed by the consent of both parties to the agreement, can be altered at the dictation of one; and the most patient research is not likely to result in the discovery of such a decision in the records of English law. The men have no case, and must know it, because the organizer of their own

union has visited Toronto to tell them so. Their own common sense must tell them that the employers cannot possibly make a second agreement with them, in good faith, upon the basis of this broken agreement. The employers will feel justified, and will be considered by other people to be justified, in breaking the new agreement whenever they find it expedient to do so. In other words, the plumbers' action in this matter is an injury to the steady development of the condition of labor, and the best thing that their own party can do is to make common cause with the employers against them.

Adding to Another Architect's Work.

In France, among architects of the inner circle, not only is a designer's drawing his private property but even, so long as he is alive, his executed conception. If an owner wishes to add to his building with the help of a new architect he must expect a new design, for the new architect would think it an infringement of professional etiquette to repeat an idea developed in his predecessor's work. As an aid to establishing the permanent relation between architect and client that the profession upholds as the ideal, this practice is a good one. An owner will not be so likely to change his architect for trifling reasons. He will be at any rate most likely to put an addition into the hands of the original designer. But as to the question of a substitute architect evading the awkwardness of working with another man's design by diverging from it in the points which distinguish it, the fundamental value of this phase of etiquette is doubtful. Granted that the owner knows and accepts the consequence of a change of architects, and that his interest in the matter need not affect the question; as a matter only of etiquette—if all consideration is to be centred on the original architect, the proprietor of the design—would not his interest be best served by following out his ideas as much as possible in the new work? Variation is competition; and, if the original designer has any proprietary right in the executed design, it ought to be the right to demand its continuation. Etiquette comes in in the maintenance of good relations between the architects. The quarrel, if there is one, is not their quarrel. A superseding architect owes it to his own reputation as well as to the undefined interest which the original architect has in the design to communicate with the original architect, if they are neighbours, in the same town or association. If he does not feel at ease in his position enough to do this, and cannot explain his position, the presumption is that he is a deliberate supplanter; an offender against, not only the original architect of the building, but the whole profession. Of course these remarks do not apply to trifles but to buildings of a certain importance, such as that upon which these remarks are based, which is now being added to in Montreal.

The Campanile of St. Mark's.

As we go to press comes the news that "the detached bell tower of St. Mark's church of Venice which was founded in 888 has collapsed utterly". This can only mean a total fall in some manner and to those who are familiar with the importance of the campanile as a feature, not only in the piazza of St. Mark, but as an essential part of the group of buildings seen from the