

or other commercial structures, and fire underwriters and city surveyors who pass upon such structures, paper read before the Chicago Fire Underwriters' should have this information. Every contribution to the discussion of this question by an expert is of value. We, therefore, quote the following from a Association by Mr. W. L. B. Jenny, a prominent local architect. He considers the best method of rendering a mercantile building fireproof to be a steel construction with an adequate foundation, the exterior walls of brick with terra cotta trimmings; the fire proofing and the floors to be of porous terra cotta that has been thoroughly tested, or with concrete strengthened with square rods twisted; the floors to be of smooth concrete; the doors to be of metal. These doors can be ornamental or as plain as desired. Mr. Jenny is of the opinion that in such a building the stock can be entirely consumed with but little injury to the building other than smoking the walls and ceilings and the blistering of the paint, and that, if the building is protected from external fires by outside shutters, then the windows will be destroyed, but if there is no danger from outside fires the shutters can be on the inside of the building, and if closed will save the windows. The author states that when substantial iron window frames and sashes shall be available, as probably they soon will be, the loss to the building will be little more than the glass, the interior painting and kalsomining. For the preservation of the contents of the building strictly fireproof division walls, with shutters to all outside openings where there is danger from other buildings, and to light shafts and stairways connecting the different stories of the building, are recommended. It is claimed that, if these methods are intelligently applied, they will add but a small percentage to the cost of the usual fireproof building.

CANADIAN GOODS BOYCOTTED IN GREAT BRITAIN.

The magnanimity of Canada in granting tariff concessions to Great Britain seems to have been without its proper effect in removing objections to the entrance of Canadian goods into the English market. According to the *Canadian Architect & Builder*, an effort has been made by the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners of Great Britain to boycott Canadian and United States joinery. This Society recently issued a circular to its members requesting them not to fix or use foreign joinery, and drawing special attention to the importation of doors, windows, etc., from America, which they claimed were manufactured under unfair conditions and by ill-paid labor. Several weeks were granted before the injunction was to be put in operation, but on a certain date the members were, in substance, instructed to band together to prohibit the importation of such joinery. For many years large quantities of manufactured joinery have been exported from Canada and the United

States to Great Britain, and this is, we believe, the first organized effort that has been made to restrict importation.

CANADA MISUNDERSTOOD IN GREAT BRITAIN.

The charge that our goods are made under "unfair conditions and by ill-paid labour" has no foundation. We have made enquiries in this city as to the wages earned in wood-work factories and the conditions under which the artisans work, and we have no hesitation in declaring that the wood-workers in Montreal and in this Province are at least in as favourable circumstances as those in Great Britain who are engaged in similar work. In some respects they are under far better conditions, and draw better and more regular wages, the purchasing value of wages being considered, than those of the same class in the old land. It is natural this should be so. Great Britain has to import all the raw materials for carpenter and joiner work. She has to sell those materials when manufactured in home factories in competition with factories which buy raw materials at their doors.

CANADA'S ADVANTAGE.

This is an advantage which puts the Canadian exporter of sashes and doors in a position to undersell the British maker, even if he pays the Canadian workpeople considerably higher wages. Another advantage the Canadian manufacturer has is the enormous demand he has to meet. This necessitates his use of the best machinery for rapid and well-finished work, in which respect he is ahead of British competitors. This too ensures his men regular employment, which is a most important factor in the wages' question. The men in the principal wood-working factory in this city have been making overtime for months, and it is our lot often to see them emerge from the yard at 9 p.m., which they leave more like merry school-boys than men who are working under "unfair conditions," and whose labour is "ill-paid." Such happiness and contentment shown by a body of workmen when quitting work we venture to say is never seen in Great Britain. The boycotting of Canadian goods by British workmen shows that the Free Trade principle is not held universally by the artisan classes of the old land. There is reason to believe that this

UNWILE AND UNGRATEFUL BOYCOTT

of our goods has arisen from this country, and the United States being regarded as one nation. In the States the sweating system exists in the wood-working trade, and prison labour is employed in making sashes and doors. No such conditions exist in Canada. But the British workman, being ignorant of the political standing of Canada, and of its social conditions, confuses us with Americans, and boycotts our goods out of indignation against objectionable American labour conditions from which we are entirely free. The German exporters of goods to Great Britain stamp on them "Made in Germany," if that is likely to help sales. It would be well, as our conten-