

The walls of the building are set back from the facade 18 or 20 feet, forming a covered loggia, which surrounds the entire building.

The facade of the Mines and Metallurgy Building may be likened to a screen bearing the same relation to this structure as do the colonnades of the adjoining buildings to their structures.

The base of this screen consists of sculptured panels illustrating in bold relief mining and metallurgical operations in symbolical representations, the background to the sculptured figures being of a rough, golden colored glass, which will be illuminated at night and show the figures in silhouette. The figures are more than life size. As a building for housing Exposition exhibits it was argued that it should express externally as much friendly dignity as would be compatible with its ephemeral character; that it would be incongruous, however, to disguise its ephemeral character by the garb of severe and classic forms which we associate with the most lasting architectural monuments of antiquity; and that, furthermore—being a part of the greatest "show" ever attempted—it undoubtedly should be novel, striking and full of life.

The style of architecture which it represents has been a source of much speculation.

"Some have attempted to classify it as an example of the 'nouveau art,'" said Mr. Theo. C. Link, the architect of the building, "but when I recently noticed an English art critic say, in protesting against its invasion of Great Britain, that this 'nouveau art' is 'a malady, the pernicious virus of which becomes more acute the further it travels,' I feel a strong personal solicitude for a properly conducted baptismal ceremony."

"Let us, therefore, name it Secession Architecture. Perhaps I will have to explain what Secession Architecture is, if the name should not make it quite clear. It means architectural liberty and emancipation with a strong plea for individuality. It is a breaking away from conventionality in design; it is more an architecture of feeling than of formula."

#### RECENT LEGAL DECISIONS AFFECTING THE MINING INDUSTRY.

**S**TAR Mining & Milling Co., Ltd. Ly., v. Byron N. White Co., recently reported.

This was an appeal to the Full Court upon the form of order providing for inspection of underground workings. The plaintiffs, the owners of the Heber Fraction and Rabbit Paw mineral claims, brought an action for damages for trespass against the defendants, owners of adjoining mineral claims, the Slocan Star and the Silversmith, located and recorded in October, 1891.

The defendants alleged that in carrying on mining operations upon their claims they discovered a vein

with its apex on their claims, and which in its downward course extended outside the limits of their claims into the ground comprised within the surface location of the plaintiff's claims, and that it was in following this vein that they had entered underneath the plaintiff's claims (which they said they had a lawful right to do) and that was the alleged trespass.

The plaintiffs alleged that the defendants were allowing their workings to cave in, etc., and were causing damage to the plaintiffs, and upon their application the late Chief Justice made the inspection order complained of.

In this order the plaintiffs undertook by their counsel to be responsible for any damage they might be liable for by reason of the inspection, and that the information obtained would be used for the purposes of the action only.

It granted leave to the plaintiffs, by their representatives to the number of 10, to enter into the mineral claims and to inspect and make plans of the workings, so far as necessary to ascertain whether defendants



had worked or were working under the plaintiffs' claims, the nature of the working and the quantity of ore removed; also to ascertain the apex, and location thereof, as to veins mined by defendants under plaintiffs' ground.

For those purposes they might inspect and copy the workings or mining plans of defendants, take samples, make observations and try experiments.

The defendants in their appeal urged that plaintiffs should give security as to damages, other than counsels' undertaking, and that they should not be allowed to copy plans, etc., and that for business reasons one company's business should not be disclosed to another. That taking of samples should be limited to a reasonable amount, and experiments not allowed at all.

The court, however, dismissed the appeal with costs, but struck out the phrase "try experiments," that being assented to by the plaintiffs. CATO.