

override the provisions of the ancient enactment, but this Act not being retrospective, all persons in the enjoyment of a side-light for twenty years prior to the passing of the Ontario law can enforce by legal process their right to a continuance of the same.

THE Toronto Collegiate Institute Board have invited architects to submit competitive designs for their proposed new building. A glance at the circular issued by the Board to the architects is sufficient to show that nothing but regret and annoyance is likely to be the reward of any architect who may engage in this competition. About the only thing in the way of detailed information afforded by the circular is that "the Property Committee reserves to itself the power of selecting or refusing any or all designs submitted," and "the Board will, if they deem fit, award the sum of \$100 to second best plan, and \$50 to third." The Secretary of the O. A. A. pointed out to the Collegiate Board that if they hoped to enlist the services of the most skillful men in the profession, the conditions would have to be revised in many particulars. The correspondence which took place on the subject has been printed and forwarded to each member of the O. A. A. The chairman of the Collegiate Institute Board promised to have the terms of the competition amended as suggested, in order that they might prove acceptable to the architects, but this was not done, the chairman of the Property Committee to whom the matter was referred, being of the opinion that no changes were necessary, which opinion he supplemented by the impertinent remark that the Ontario Association of Architects apparently wanted the brains of the Board to guide them, whereas the Board desired to get the brain-power and skill of the Ontario Association of Architects. The circumstances would have justified him in adding that the object of the Board was to get the brain-power and skill without paying for it. In the competition, nothing like a detailed statement of the requirements has been given, no expert is to be appointed to judge the plans, and the Board reserves the right to reject all the designs sent in, or "should they see fit," they may award the magnificent amounts of \$100 and \$50 respectively! What a brilliant conception this of justice and the eternal fitness of things, to say nothing of liberality! We might ask the architects of Ontario these questions: "What think you of the estimate placed upon the value of the services you can render? How do you propose to show your appreciation of this estimate? As an architect in another column correctly puts it, it rests with you to say what kind of treatment shall be accorded you. If architects will individually and as a profession resent such unfair treatment, and show their *esprit de corps* by refusing to have anything whatever to do with such unsatisfactory affairs, the building competitions evil, which is steadily growing worse, will soon be remedied. There is another side to this question, and it is that the taxpayers of Toronto will be called upon to pay for the proposed Collegiate Institute building, and have a right to insist that the best design obtainable shall be secured. It is a foregone conclusion, however, that the most skillful architects will not enter the competition, and consequently the probabilities are all opposed to the idea that the design chosen will be the best which might have been had.

THROUGH the mediation of the President of the Toronto Board of Trade, conferences of the parties to the dispute in the building trades in the city have taken place, and have resulted in a settlement. The stonemasons, whose demand was for 45 cents per hour, or an increase of 7 cents per hour, have agreed to accept 43 cents for a period of three years from April 1st; the agreement with the bricklayers is for five years at 35 cents per hour for the first year and 36 cents for the subsequent four years; the laborers are to be paid 20 cents for one year, and 21 cents for four years following; and the stonemasons, 35 cents for two years and 36 cents for three years. A clause in the agreement provides that a conference between the parties thereto shall be held four months prior to its termination to consider all matters as to their future relations. While the entire community will doubtless find in this adjustment of the difficulty, a subject of congratulation, there will come corresponding regret that the strike was not by such a reasonable course of action, entirely

prevented. Had that been done, many building projects would now be under way which under the circumstances have been temporarily if not permanently abandoned; each individual workman would have been from one to two hundred dollars better off than at present; and the business community would not have had to struggle with the difficulties imposed upon it by the withdrawal from circulation of a large amount of money, and the necessity of supplying on credit the necessities of life to the strikers and their families, many of whom, no doubt, as is usual at the close of every winter, were in debt when the strike began. It is but another illustration of the hardship and loss which invariably result from recourse to strike methods.

The present is a fitting time to enquire what course should be adopted for the future in deciding the relationship as to rate of wages, hours of labor, etc., of the employee to his employer. The clause in the agreement just concluded in Toronto which provides that a conference shall be held four months before the agreement expires, is a step in the right direction, and seems to indicate that wiser counsels will hereafter prevail. This is the manner in which we hope to see what is known as the "labor problem" solved. There are other methods by which to solve it, but they are not in keeping with the progress which the world is making in other directions in this nineteenth century. One good suggestion made by one of our correspondents elsewhere is, for the employers to throw the responsibility of refusing to grant an increase of wages upon the proprietors of new buildings. If this were done, public opinion would very soon be brought to bear for the speedy settlement of all strikes. If the demands for increased wages continue to arise, the contractors will have no other course open to them than to charge the extra amount to the cost of the building. This would undoubtedly react seriously upon the welfare of the workmen, and indeed the entire community, by greatly reducing the volume of building operations. It is to be hoped that workmen will perceive that this question has more than one bearing upon their interests, and therefore requires to be looked at from different standpoints. Neither should it be forgotten that conditions in the building trades are subject to change, and the rate of wages which can be paid in an exceptionally prosperous season should not be expected or demanded under reversed conditions. Last year, for example, certain contractors in Toronto required to have so much stonemasonry done in a specified time, that they offered to pay seven cents per hour above the union rate of wages. This exceptional circumstance, we are informed, led to the demand being made this year by the stonemasons for an advance to 45 cents per hour—their method of reasoning being that as some contractors paid this figure last year, they were able to pay it for all time to come. The fact that the present season promised to be much less active than last, seems never to have been considered. We point to these circumstances in the hope that such narrow views as too often have marked the past, will not be allowed to prevail in the future, but that recognition will be accorded the fact that the interests of capital and labor are identical.

THE Canadian correspondent of the *American Architect* embodied in one of his recent letters the following statements: "The architects of the Province of Quebec are talking about the formation of a Provincial Association and seeking legislation on the lines of the association of Ontario. A meeting for this purpose was said to be announced to be held in Montreal, but *nothing seems to have come of it*, and indeed what else could one expect when for the last twenty years attempts have been made to draw the architects together but all have failed. The jealousies of Montreal's architects are positively ridiculous. Beginning with the natural dislike that usually exists between 'two of a trade,' this feeling is stimulated into an antipathy in the hearts of one race against the other, and the English speaking and the French are separated by a wide gulf. This natural racial dislike culminates in a general *hatred* of every individual in the profession, and so the formation of an association among such very unethical men is an *impossibility*. The Quebec association, however, very kindly wishes to embrace all the Montreal archi-