

fects, but they have stayed proceedings until the Ontario architects' bill should have been passed or thrown out, in order to see what chances they were likely to have of success. Perhaps if the Montreal men get some kind friend to take them by the hand they may be induced to embrace each other." (The italics are ours.)

Most of the statements contained in the above extract are so entirely at variance with the situation at present existing in Quebec, that in justice to the architects of that province, more particularly those of the city of Montreal, we feel it to be a duty to enter our strong protest against them, as well as to expose their "positively ridiculous" misrepresentations. We can assure the profession in Ontario and elsewhere that hatred is not the prevailing sentiment among the architects of Montreal and the province of Quebec; that something *has* come of the efforts being made to form a Provincial association; that the formation of such an association is *not* an impossibility, but at the present moment has been brought to the verge of accomplishment, and this result has been attained by the hearty co-operation of English and French architects. It is doubtless true that jealousies have existed among members of the profession in Montreal, but we would ask the correspondent in question to point to a city where they are unknown. Certainly it cannot be said that Ontario is blameless in this respect. This being the case, why should the architects of Montreal be held up before the world as an example of "unethical men?" Nor does it follow that the existence of jealousies and the failure of past efforts to form an association are sufficient premises upon which to declare the ultimate success of such endeavors impossible. The success which has crowned the efforts of the architects of Ontario is the best possible proof of this. The formation of the Ontario Association of Architects was accomplished in the face of strong local jealousies, and after the failure of several past attempts to secure such a result. The architects of Quebec have no greater difficulties to surmount than those which their brethren in Ontario have overcome, and there is not the slightest room to doubt that equal success will attend their efforts. It is proverbially an unwise thing for people who live in glass houses to cast stones at their neighbors. In view of the results which have followed the formation of the O. A. A. in the direction of promoting good-fellowship among members of the profession, enabling them to work unitedly for the uplifting of the profession and the advancement of their collective and individual interests, the Canadian correspondent of our American contemporary might have made nobler use of his pen had he commended and sought to promote the movement on the part of the architects of Quebec for closer fraternity and the benefits arising therefrom, instead of seeking to widen the gulf which in his imagination at least, exists. We are in a position to know that the sentiments which he has expressed are not shared by the members of the profession in Ontario. On the contrary, anxiety prevails to see the organization of the architects of Quebec accomplished, and any assistance which the Ontario Association through its officers may be able to give, will be cheerfully accorded.

WHAT a specimen of the enlightenment of the present age is our Mechanics' Lien Law! "Unless he signs an agreement to the contrary, every mechanic, machinist, builder, miner, laborer, contractor or any other person doing work upon, or furnishing materials to be used in the construction, alteration or repairs of any building or erection *** shall, by virtue of being so employed, or furnishing, have a lien for the price of the work, machinery or materials, upon the building *** and the lands occupied thereby ***" which being interpreted simply means that, if a contractor owes a workman that he has employed upon a particular building a portion of his wages, or if the contractor has not paid for material supplied to him for a particular building, the workman or the supplier of the material can claim the amount due to him from the owner of the building and enforce payment of his claim from him. Was there ever a more childish law? Was there ever a law which saddled upon an innocent person the responsibilities of liabilities assumed by

a third party, that has not been repealed before this? Surely then, it is time this iniquitous and foolish piece of legislation were taken off the Statutes. How is it possible that such an Act has become law? Its intention is to provide a protection for the workman against his employer in case his employer turns out to be an unscrupulous man who will defraud him of his wages. But is not this protection guaranteed him by the ordinary process of the law? Why should he need this special protection, and a protection which is a positive fraud upon an innocent person? The law robs Peter to pay Paul—Paul sometimes being a rascal who, because he thinks it is easier to get Peter (the proprietor) to pay him his wages than his "boss," goes and sets the machinery of the law in motion to screw out of Peter money owed him by another person. We might just as well have a bakers' lien law, and allow the baker who makes the bread to come down upon the man who eats it, because the master baker for whom it is made and who sells it has not paid his workman. In a case of this sort the baker's only remedy is to sue his master for his wages. Cannot the mechanic of the building trade do the same thing? Are contractors so notoriously evilly disposed, that the men they employ need special protection? And supposing they are, and that the mechanic must be protected, surely it would be only fair that he should have a lien upon the *contractor's* property—his horse, his cart, or his private goods and chattels. According to the lien law, the lien takes precedence of other claims upon the property or building. According to the law of sales for the recovery of mortgage on chattels, the landlord's claims for rent must first be settled and no doubt it would be easy to assign the right place for a lien holder's claim to come in, and probably directly after the landlord's would but be fair and just; but there should be no power in the hands of a lien holder to enforce a sale to recover his wages immediately he considers them due. A certain time should be allowed the contractor before a lien can be taken out, or put on. As the law stands, directly a man entertains a suspicion that possibly he may not be paid just as soon as he would like to be paid, he goes and claps on a lien, to the excessive annoyance and inconvenience of the owner of the building who, believing everything is going on smoothly about his building and having no cause whatever to think about liens, suddenly finds this "sword of Damocles" suspended over his head. He has already paid the contractor the contract amounts for the material supplied and the labour expended, with the contractor's rightful profit tacked on, and to his bewilderment he finds himself suddenly called upon to pay over again the amount of wages and the costs of material which he has never ordered and knows nothing about, except that as he can see his house has been built. The proprietor's only safety against such a law is, that he shall demand that the contractor who is successful in obtaining the work, shall deposit with him a marked cheque or a bond from responsible men equal to a considerable portion of the cost of materials and labor supplied. The proprietor must protect himself as long as this law exists, and though we should be sorry to see worthy builders hampered, yet when there is such a stringent law for the protection of the employee against the employer, because some employers are not honest men, the good must suffer with the bad. Proprietors and contractors should work together to get this law repealed.

THE Act of Registration of the Ontario Association of Architects, was opposed by some members in the Ontario House on the ground that there was no necessity for it on account of the safety of the public either in respect to loss of life or money. On these grounds some clauses which would have protected the public were struck out and the Act very much emasculated. However, it was thought that an Act that gave a few unimportant privileges was better than no Act, and it was determined by the profession to put it into force. This conclusion was arrived at the more readily, as the committee who had the matter in hand had every reason to believe that before many weeks would pass they would be able to cite an example which would drive home to some at least the fact that it would be advisable, to say the least, that those who professed to be architects should