

be put a stop to in very short order by making those who are responsible suffer the consequences of their own carelessness or ignorance, and the persons whom we would hold responsible are the contractor, the foreman and the scaffold-er. But so long as little or no effort is made to place the consequence of accidents on the right shoulders, so long will they happen. Those in authority should have persons to examine into any accident where lives have been endangered, even though no fatality results. Waiting until some one is killed before investigating an accident, is on a par with locking the stable door after the horse has been stolen. With a stringent building law and competent building inspectors, no unsafe building would be erected, and few if any dangerous scaffolds. The last two accidents could have, and very likely would have occurred, even though there had been an inspector of scaffolds, and he could not have been held responsible, as no man or set of men could be expected to see that every put-log, scaffold pole and plank that enters into the erection of the scaffolds of a city is perfectly sound. It would require a tremendous amount of time to examine every put-log to see if it was sound, and not attacked by dry-rot. That can only be done by the man who actually erects the scaffold, as he handles every piece, and he, before all others, should be accountable for all bad materials entering the scaffold.

The suggestion has been made that architects should be held responsible for the strength of scaffolds necessary to the erection of buildings according to their designs. This would only be a partial remedy, as possibly not one half of all the buildings erected are under the supervision of an architect. However, it would not be just to throw upon an architect such responsibility. He has many duties to perform, and has no more time to spare than will allow him to see that the building is being carried out according to his plans and specifications. He might be able to give a general supervision to the scaffolds and determine whether they were properly put up, but he would not have the time, nor could he be expected to examine every piece of timber in the scaffolds of a building to determine their strength or if they were free from rot of every description. Workmen as a rule do not like to receive any advice from an architect as to the strength of scaffolds or ladders. Very often they will persist in endangering their lives after they have been warned, with no other apparent reason than to show that they do not desire advice, or do not value their lives. It is very often necessary to insist on men using reasonable caution when engaged in dangerous positions, and when such is the case, their employer or foreman should not be held accountable.

#### "CANADIAN ARCHITECT AND BUILDER" SERIES OF PRIZE COMPETITIONS.

**W**E have decided to hold a series of competitions of work which will be of interest to our general readers. While we must make the paper one of especial interest to architects, it is also our desire to have as much matter as possible which will be both useful and interesting to our many other subscribers.

We have not yet decided the subjects for the competitions or their arrangement, but we may mention a few which we have determined to submit to competition, viz :

The plan of a bath room, showing the best position of fixtures, details of finish, with specifications of fixtures.

Suitable details for the interior of a small house—details to include those for staircase, doors, architraves, base, windows, two mantles, etc.

Plan of serving pantry, showing cupboards, shelving, etc., with details of same.

Design for verandah, with details.

" " front fence, with details.

" " front door, with details.

" " three plaster cornices.

Essay on Heating.

" " Plumbing.

We do not propose to give large prizes, but we hope they will be sufficient to induce large numbers to enter the various competitions.

Full particulars of these competitions will appear in the CANADIAN ARCHITECT AND BUILDER for September.

#### THE CITY OF TORONTO WATER FRONT.

**T**HE importance to a growing town or city of securing railway connections, or to a railway of gaining access to a large distributing centre, cannot be estimated with any closeness in figures. The time was, and that not many years ago, when Toronto had to make great sacrifices to secure railway facilities. No matter what demands a railway corporation made, they had to be conceded, or the service which it might render might be transferred to another point. But Toronto has grown beyond dependence on railways. In fact, the position is reversed. Now it is the railways that must gain access to this city at any cost. But railway-like, they prefer to gain all they can with as small cost to themselves as possible, little caring how much injury may accrue to others. The Grand Trunk came in years ago, when Toronto had to have railway connections, and appropriated the bay front. At that time it may not have been a serious matter that a number of railway tracks cut off the inhabitants from the water. There were not many tracks, there were not many trains, there were not many inhabitants, nor were they in any great hurry, and could without much inconvenience wait while one of the short trains of that day made its way along the esplanade. But now it is different. There are thousands of people crossing these tracks every day to the steamboats which carry them to the many places of resort. This is not a matter of pleasure only to these people; it is also a question of health. That which is of great importance to the healthfulness of a people should receive every consideration, certainly more than the material welfare of a railway corporation. It is a question if the people of Toronto would have opposed the scheme of the C. P. R. to take possession of a very large and important tract of land in front of the most central and valuable part of the city, if they had not gone about it in a most arrogant and domineering manner. The city was informed that the C. P. R. wanted the land and that it would take possession of the city front whether or no. It mattered not that the people did not wish to be served by the railway at so great a cost, and that the land could not be made to serve any useful purposes by the railway. The railway wanted to come to Toronto and do business with its people, and because a Railway Act which makes every provision to allow railway corporations to expropriate everything of value to them, and none to protect the individual in his rights, enables them to take an arrogant position, they proclaim that they do not care whether the people of Toronto want them or not, they are coming, and they will also take all the land they want for railway purposes or otherwise, even though by so doing they cut off the people from the water front. When it is remembered that the bay front from Brock street to Simcoe street is in the possession of the G. T. R., so that no one can make any use of it whatever, some slight appreciation can be gained of the unfathomable depth of the C. P. R. assurance when they coolly propose to extend the barriers to Yonge street. From Yonge street to Brock street is very nearly one mile, and for the entire distance it would not be possible to gain access to the water front except by passing over the property of either the G. T. R. or C. P. R. A people that would quietly submit to such wholesale expropriation, without protest, followed by action, would not be deserving of even the right to have a look at the water of the bay across the railway tracks. These two railways would if they got their own way allow the people but a small and very inefficient outlet to the lake at some point so far east that it would not suit the convenience of any of the citizens except a few who might live directly north of such outlet. We would then see our people going long distances east and west, as the case might be, through the hot and dusty streets to gain the only outlet to the cool and refreshing lake breezes. Such a condition of things must not be. The convenience of the railways is of comparatively little importance, compared with the convenience to, and the health of, the citizens of Toronto.

The railways would not be nearly so anxious to secure the