

you are desired to fill up half of one of them with sawdust, and then you are told to fill the other box with eggs and to put into the unoccupied half of the first box more eggs than you can get in without breaking them, what would you do? The first thing that would occur to you no doubt would be to violate the condition and take out the saw dust and take the whole box for your eggs, and this is what the second prize man has done, but others who thought it out came to the conclusion that it would be wiser to get eggs of a slightly smaller diameter, and so succeeded in getting in the correct number without violating the conditions or materially changing the requirements. But our friend Knox thinks the man who takes out the sawdust has done the cleverest thing. The sawdust in this case represents office space from which the company were desirous of obtaining a rental.

It is to be doubted whether good planning was or was not one of the points on which Mr. Knox based his opinion, and it may be said that such things as w. c.'s and ladies cloak rooms are not of such importance as other requirements, but still I venture to suggest that such unmentionable places require some consideration. I may be allowed to direct the attention of Mr. Knox to the fact that in the design in question the w. c.'s for the use of the lady clerks of the company open directly out of the general office for the male clerks, and directly at the foot of the stairs leading up to the male clerks' lavatories, board room, directors' room, lunch room, store room, and so on. It would be well for architects who know that ladies like a little privacy, to see that their plans will be examined in future by some one who knows this much at any rate. As I have said it is not my intention here to criticize the general arrangement of the plan, I will not take up any more of your space.

Yours very truly,

"A KICKER."

TORONTO COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE BUILDING COMPETITION.

TORONTO, June 11th, 1890.

Editor CANADIAN ARCHITECT AND BUILDER.

SIR:—Though not a funny man, I have been more amused than perhaps most of the architects who have read the printed correspondence received by us yesterday, re Collegiate Institute competition, because I can say "I told you so!"

Our young and "impertinent" Association has received such a rebuff as, I trust, may never be mine as an individual to experience, though as individuals, each member of the O. A. A. is no doubt suffering under the indignity, and reaching around to kick somebody. Now let us kick the right party.

If in a brawl I get a knock down, I am likely to feel hurt, but might I not have remained elsewhere? If we don't like this treatment, the remedy is in our own hands. Let us discourage the practice of architectural competitions altogether. For some years I have done my little part in that direction, and shall so continue. Some say, "they have done good," and that it "gives the young men a chance"; others, that "contractors have to compete, why not architects?" I cannot see the parallel. Do we invite carpenters to set up the framework of a row of cottages that we may select the strongest and employ its framer to complete one? Does a speculator, wishing to cut a farm up into building lots, invite surveyors to take measurements and notes, showing the greatest frontage each can make of it, that one may be employed to make a plan of it? Or in litigation, do we invite lawyers to send in briefs that we may select the most likely and employ its compiler to conduct our case? The rejected ones in each competition not even getting "thank you." Only in this light can I regard the too common advertisements addressed to architects. Are we so simple as to obey such bidding? Then do we deserve the treatment we receive. Our employment demands the most painstaking attention and the strictest integrity. Why, then, are we treated with suspicion and contempt? Our capabilities, preparation, experience and responsibilities must equal those required in any profession, then why not assume the dignity and command the respect? What other class of men would have begged of a school board the privilege of giving a month's labor gratis, or would have been treated to such gratuitous insult?

I am far from being wealthy, nor am I overburdened with commissions, especially this season, but, sir, what little business I am entrusted with I propose to do on business principles; my fees understood and payment assured—then my clients' interests receive my best attention, and I have preserved my self respect.

I may scarcely hope to have a second, but beg to record my humble conviction that the more creditable and profitable course for the O. A. A. would be to declare collectively and individually against any and all architects' competitions in this or any country. It is good practice for students, but should be dropped on entering business life.

Let an architect be engaged on the strength of his known or supposed ability and integrity; let him work up a practice and reputation as other professional men do, and when competitive designs cease to go a begging, he will be sought after and respected. Let a school board, as would an individual, employ whom they choose, and when he is not wasting his time and talents over competitions, he will be able to design quite as creditably and more satisfactorily to his clients, when enjoying their confidence, than as a stranger and without prospect of remuneration. An incompetent man may sometimes be selected, but can matters be any worse than at present? Competitions are always unsatisfactory to the greater number interested, and because unbusinesslike in principle, always will be. In the hope that this latest example may be an eye opener, I remain,

Yours truly,

M. B. AYLSWORTH.

THE LESSON OF THE RECENT STRIKE.

TORONTO, June 9th, 1890.

Editor CANADIAN ARCHITECT AND BUILDER.

SO our workmen have at last seen fit to bring the recent labor dispute to an end by accepting a compromise with the master builders. The men have had it almost their own way, but their long idleness has shown them the folly of their ways, and the terms of the agreement that settles the wages of the next five years, shows only too plainly that they do not care about another strike just yet. But why did our master builders come to an agreement like this at all? Was it for the sake of peace, or was it that they could not hold out longer? Here is a case in which our men were getting fair wages; there was no prospect of a kind that could in any way justify a demand for increased wages, yet they determine by joint action to enforce such a demand. They will not listen to reason, but with the childish freak that has become their custom when they cannot get what they want, they refuse to work.

But we raised the question why did the master builders give in? and we will ask another question: What have the master builders got to do with the matter at all? Certainly the men are employed by the masters, but in a different way from that sense in which a private individual employs a domestic servant. Here the master of the house says what wages he will pay, and if the servant does not like them, she goes somewhere else. But the workmen have banded together, and the question is not as between master and servant but as between (as they are so fond of saying) capital and labor. It is *not* then a dispute between master builders and workmen, but between workmen and the *proprietors*. By the enforcement of higher and stated rates of wages it is not the contractor who is affected (except so far as existing contracts are concerned)—it is the public—the public who pay the workmen through the contractor, the agent of the public. In the dispute between "labor and capital," the proprietors—the public—who represent the capital—keep out of the way; they leave the builder to fight it out, and when he can no longer hold out because they are themselves pressing him, he gives in—the result of being between two fires—and the public are content, and see not that it is they who are beaten. Of course the masters give in; were we a master builder, we would not hold out an hour against a demand for increased wages by these cowardly unions. Why should we be made to bear the brunt of opposing them when it's no concern of ours? No, if the public will not back up the masters against exorbitant demands, let the masters give in and let the public pay whatever