

experience cannot be gainsaid. It may take a number of years after the passing of the Bill before the architectural profession will feel any direct benefit from it, but much benefit must come sooner or later in many ways. It will have a tendency to create specialists in many branches of the science, just as they have in Europe. One man may become an authority on Gothic, another on Classic, while a third will be known as an oracle on the Renaissance. Ontario is sufficiently advanced in wealth and artistic requirements to give ample scope for specialists in every department of architecture, but in order to attain eminence in any one of them the profession must be protected so far as the public interests will permit.

**The City of Toronto
v. Neelon.**

MR. Neelon's action against Mr. Lennox, architect of the new city buildings, and the City of Toronto, to recover damages for alleged wrongful dismissal from his position as contractor for the work, has been argued in the Supreme Court. The verdict of the Court confirms the decisions of the inferior Courts, which, as our readers know, were adverse to Mr. Neelon's claims. The case will no doubt be carried to the Privy Council, but there would now seem to be little reason to expect a reversal of the decisions of the several Courts through which it has already passed.

**The Late
Mr. Atwood.**

MR. Chas. B. Atwood, well known as one of the architects chosen to design some of the more prominent buildings at the World's Fair, died at his home at Buena Park, Chicago, Dec. 19th, after a short and painful illness. Mr. Atwood had a wide reputation in the United States as an architect of more than ordinary ability. He followed, to some extent, the lines laid down by the late Mr. Richardson, to which he added much that was his own, and which evinced originality and scholarly thought. His best works at the World's Fair were the Art Palace and the Peristyle, two buildings that were much admired by members of the profession who had the pleasure of seeing them. Mr. Atwood was born in Boston, Mass., forty-six years ago. He went to Chicago in 1890 and entered into partnership with D. H. Burnham, the eminent western architect, and was a member of the firm when he died. He was unmarried, "for," as he told the writer on one occasion, "if I was a married man my duty to my family would prevent my giving to my profession that attention I wish it to receive at my hands." He loved art, for art's sake.

**Dangerous
Structures.**

THE necessity of restricting the practice of architecture to persons properly qualified for the work was exemplified by an accident which took place in Toronto recently. The occupants of a warehouse, while engaged in loading the upper storey of the building with merchandise, observed that one of the doors on the ground floor would not close. They called the attention of the owner of the building to the fact, and he in turn brought the matter to the attention of his architect, and requested him to make an examination of the building and to estimate its strength. The result of the architect's examination showed that, allowing for the usual factor of safety, the building was barely strong enough to support its own weight. Yet, in ignorance of this fact, the occupants had placed a load of 20 tons on one of the

upper storeys, and were proceeding to add to this load, when they fortunately made the discovery which resulted in the architect's examination. The building in question is an old one, and was put up in the days when no accurate methods were employed to ascertain the strength of structures. The supports of the upper floors are $7\frac{3}{4}$ inches in diameter while those of the first storey are but 7 inches. There are, no doubt, a large number of such structures in use throughout the country, and it is too much to expect that sooner or later a disaster will not result.

Roof Construction An accident occurred on the Thursday night following Christmas that might have resulted seriously. An entertain-

ment was being held in the Mariners' Bethel Church, Philadelphia, when a heavy gale of wind lifted off part of the roof and scattered the fragments on the grounds below. A panic ensued; but, owing to the coolness of a few no one was seriously hurt. Within the last few years many buildings—public and private—have been unroofed, a condition that ought not to be possible if proper constructive methods were adopted. A roof should be so secured that its displacement could only take place with the disruption of the walls, or the building itself. Like many prevalent maladies, the unroofing of buildings seems to be altogether a modern scourge. If any buildings were so constructed in ancient or mediæval times that their roofs were blown off or destroyed by a collapse, the events were kept very quiet, for very few accidents of that sort are mentioned by the older writers. In fact, if the old builders constructed their roofs on the same lines as the examples that have come down to us from the early centuries, there was little danger of their blowing away or collapsing. The roof of Westminster Hall, apart from its ornamentation, is a solid example of fine constructive cunning, and its attachment to the walls such that divorce is rendered impossible without causing the total destruction of the latter.

Lien Laws.

MR. Dowling, Labor Commissioner of New York, has been investigating the lien laws of that State, and in a letter to a Syracuse paper states that the laws as they now stand "are of no benefit to either the working man or the owner of the buildings." Mr. Dowling has made a study of the lien law for ten years, both in his own and other States, and the fact that he has arrived at the opinion that these laws are of no benefit to either workman or owner, is a matter that deserves consideration. When lien laws were first enacted, they were intended solely and altogether to protect the workman, to place in his hands, as it were, some means by which he would be sure to get his wages. All this was right and proper, but subsequent amendments and additions to the law, enabling material men, contractors and sub-contractors to file liens and collect on them, have nullified whatever good there may have been in them at first, and so complicative and irritative have they become that many men decline to build for fear they may get entangled in the meshes of the law. In Ontario the law, as it now stands, is actually a deterrent to progress and should be stripped of all its excrescences and rendered as simple as possible. No claims should be allowed under a lien, other than actual labor done by day's work. A liberal percentage of the contractor's tender should be held by