

ing effect. The most effective buildings seem to be those where a combination of brick and stone is used as in New Scotland Yard.

Some of the carving seen on one or two recently erected buildings is good beyond all praise. This result is no doubt due to the fact that sculptors of the front rank have been secured, and have not thought it beneath their dignity to engage in this class of work.

In examining the details of modern English practice, one notices many peculiar features. Casement windows are very much used, and the greatest care is taken in jointing them so as to exclude the weather. Then again, there is a tendency to divide the heads of windows into small squares. Lead lights too are much used, glazed with clear glass. In the best work many of the joiners' mouldings are worked on the solid instead of being stuck. In brickwork the bond is always either English or Flemish; American bond is not even known. Fire-proof construction is common, and is usually of concrete filled in between girders, sometimes with a flat soffit, at others arched. Very light concrete is used, the aggregate being Portland cement and coke breeze. The ironwork seems to be very indifferent and is usually handed over to fireproofing firms who not only supply the material but also the drawings. There is little or no attempt on the part of the architect to plan the construction of the walls to meet the best special requirements of fire-proof construction, girders being often allowed to come over openings and rest on chimney breasts, or, indeed, very much wherever they happen to come. It is to be feared that this sort of thing happens in the work of even the foremost men as well as among the general rank and file.

In conclusion, it may not be amiss to point out that the advantages of two or even three years spent in London are of great value to the young architect who has already mastered the routine of office work. To be able to come in close contact with old work and study the development of the best modern work; to see different methods of construction, planning and preparing drawings; to be able to attend the architectural classes of the Royal Academy and the Architectural Association, and to test one's knowledge by subjecting oneself to examination by the Royal Institute of British Architects, are only small portions of a list that might be continued indefinitely.

THE ENTRANCE DOOR.*

It was suggested some time ago that a general effort by every member of our Guild should be made to give additional interest and profit to the winter meetings, and that this end would be helped on by some little preparation given subjects likely to elicit interested discussion. The subject mentioned by Mr. Langton is in pursuance of an idea that it would be of profit to, say, commencing with the doorway, proceed as it were to dissect a house, and from the old and the new, as we are able to recall them, discover faults to be avoided and excellencies to be revived or perpetuated. So as, no doubt, to leave the more vital parts of the house for a more competent analyst, I have been asked to enter the threshold by introducing for discussion "The Entrance Door." That pertaining to a dwelling house of moderate size is I think a subject large enough for one evening, and is one we are all most frequently interested in.

Considered as to its purposes, what are the requirements necessary to make the entrance answer all demands of utility and ornament?—for as to the latter all ages seem agreed in this, that whatever of art or adornment pertained to the house, it is on the doorways we find its concentrate expression, and the good sense of this wants no argument, as beauty wastes not its sweetness here unseen, and here bad ornament is a sin with aggravation.

The door of a dwelling house, its purpose in all cases being pretty much the same—to welcome the coming, speed the parting guest—why should they not, I venture to suggest, be all of a size? A good stout door, say 4 ft. x 7 ft., securely hinged, shutting truly into its rabbat, with solid lock and furniture, is an agreeable thing to handle, which very few double doors can be made. But, you say, how can wealth display itself by so meagre a portal? Yet, are there not examples of French, of Florentine and other Italian doorways, smaller than this, that by treatment of arch, jamb and lintel, and perhaps carved or mosaic spandril, are made infinitely more attractive than the double doors of America? The question I raise is, that except for buildings put to public uses, where it is necessary to give exit to throngs of people, is the insecure, unsubstantial looking, two-leaf door ever necessary or desirable? Should not the house that seeks to display some grandeur of proportions in its entrance, have space enough to give some hospitable shelter to the visitor at its doors and under recess, arched or otherwise, frame a door of our normal size by such studied devices of art as would render interesting the delay between the "knock and it is opened unto you"?

The size of landing of the front door is a matter of proportion, and although the nervous groping for the step caused by too small a landing is to be avoided, yet the landing can easily be made to look too large unless combined with other piazza. For elevation of door above the ground line I would make a golden mean about 3 ft. 6 in.—neither liking the necessities of the American high basement, nor being able to feel the charm of the English method, which likes to saunter into the house over one or two stone steps. Whatever the size of the entrance door,

it should be deeply recessed, being different from a window, in which the reveal is more valuable inside. The door looks repellent which is near the outside of the wall, and for which no extraneous porch head or pediment will atone. The universal panel jamb of our colonial is a recognition of this, and is a feature that with the better understanding of a free, refined, classic detail now prevalent, might be revived, redeeming at least the terrace house from the commonplace.

As to the architectural treatment of the door opening, to give due prominence to this, the main feature of the house, all depends on the acquired knowledge of detail of the architect and his skill in adapting and applying to make suitable to modern requirements. Even around Toronto there are numbers of examples of the English combination of pillar or pilaster and entablature, fan and side lights worked out with considerable refinement. For instance, the drawings of the old Canada Company's entrance, recently shown in the CANADIAN ARCHITECT AND BUILDER, compares well with the similar specimens of Old Colonial the *American Architect* is so fond of reviving for instruction and reproof. So now that the bustling progress of the last twenty years (in which the doorways have had too little study of either architect or joiner) has had praise, it is likely we will all endeavor to do more studied work on this feature of the house. As to the most desirable position for the entrance to the house, although there are no doubt many fine houses with the doors in the centre of the front, it seems to me to commit one to a somewhat unvarying type of plan, where the hall is apt to be dark and only a means of getting to the rooms. Entrances on the corner or on the side, on the other hand, give the architect an opportunity to make of the hall a delightful loitering place, with enticing vistas into the rooms.

I seem to be about the end of my ideas on the entrance door, having got into the inner hall, forgetting that indispensable feature in our climate, the vestibule. This should be large enough to render progress between doors easy and natural, but anything excessive in the size of vestibule is downright loss to the house, its purpose being merely analogous to a double window, for in any way to attempt to furnish the vestibule results in more convenience to the hall thief than to the occupants of the house.

ORGANIZATION OF CANADIAN BUILDERS.

TORONTO, Jan. 7, 1893.

EDITOR CANADIAN ARCHITECT AND BUILDER.

SIR,—In accordance with the suggestion made by you some time ago, I beg to submit the following ideas that have occurred to me, with the earnest hope that a general interest may be thereby incited among sister associations, which may result in the amalgamation of the various Builders' Associations throughout the country.

You are aware that the different exchanges and associations in the United States have united into a National Association, and that a convention is held every year in one of the leading cities for the purpose of discussing matters of interest to the trade, and of concerting measures to improve existing conditions. Through the courtesy of Mr. H. Sayward, of Boston, Secretary of the National Association, I am in possession of much valuable information regarding the progress of the Association. Among the results achieved thus far may be mentioned: 1st, the establishment of the "Uniform Contract"; 2nd, a fully defined method of apprenticeship; 3rd, a general plan for the joint settlement of disputes or differences between employers and workmen.

One very desirable result is being attained, in that workmen are becoming impressed with the fact that their employers are considering the questions that they have for so long a time been trying to solve; and they are thus becoming better disposed for a peaceful settlement of disputed points.

I may say that the Toronto Builders' Exchange is endeavoring to secure an amendment to the present Lien Law, which is acknowledged to be practically inoperative, so far as giving any security to the builder or supply merchant is concerned. Is it not reasonable to believe that such action would carry greater weight, and be more likely to succeed when proceeding from a Provincial or National Association?

I understand that the exchanges and associations in Australia and New Zealand have formed a Federal Association, with a very perfect organization, and judging from a report of their last annual conference, held in Brisbane last October, they have reason to congratulate themselves upon their success. It appears to me, that if our friends in the antipodes (who are separated from each other, in many cases, by long water stretches) can still meet, and hold such enthusiastic meetings, there surely is no reason why, in Ontario at least, where every facility for inter-communication exists, that a National or Provincial Association should not be at once formed.

I am sure that the Builders' Exchange of Toronto will heartily co-operate with other Associations to this end, and I think the assistance of the CANADIAN ARCHITECT AND BUILDER may safely be counted upon. I would suggest (with your permission) that the views of other Associations on this matter be expressed in your valuable journal. Allow me to state that any communications on this subject addressed to the undersigned would be received with much pleasure.

Yours truly,

JOHN L. PHILLIPS,
Sec'y Toronto Builders' Exchange.

*Paper read before the Toronto Architectural Guild, by Mr. John Gemmill.