

The Canadian Architect & Builder

A Journal of
Constructive and Decorative Art

PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY

HUGH C. MACLEAN, LIMITED
TORONTO, CANADA.

HEAD OFFICE - Confederation Life Building, TORONTO
Telephone Main 2,62

MONTREAL - Telephone Main 2299. B34 Board of Trade
D. BURNSIDE, Representative

WINNIPEG - Telephone 224. 330 Smith St.
ROLAND F. HILL, Representative

VANCOUVER - Telephone 2248. 615 Hastings St.
GEO. A. GALL, Representative

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Canada and Great Britain - - \$2.00

United States and Foreign - - 2.50

Toronto

JANUARY, 1907

Montreal

OPINIONS upon the proposal to make of the architectural profession a closed corporation as outlined in the project of an act of incorporation of the Institute of Architects of Canada have been pretty generally expressed of late. Not for a long time has so much general interest been evinced by the profession in any project as that which is now under discussion. The question of granting a charter to a Dominion organization has stirred up the provincial associations to a realization of what they stand to lose should the Institute of Architects of Canada become a chartered body, with the powers they have requested.

At a recent meeting of the P. Q. A. A., held in Montreal on December 20 last, a frank discussion of the institute question revealed a fear on the part of some that the charter of the provincial organization stood in danger. It was pointed out by Mr. Doran that the establishment of a Dominion licensing body, side by side with the provincial association, constituted an infringement of the P. Q. A. A.'s charter, in that the Dominion body would have power to override its decisions. In Quebec there is also evidenced by the more thoughtful architects a very commendable anxiety to safeguard the high standard of education which is there required by the P. Q. A. A. This is proving one of the strongest factors of opposition the I. A. C. will have to encounter in that province, not because architects oppose education, but because they fear the Institute will not go far enough in the matter.

In Ontario the struggle is going to centre about the self-same topic. The other day a conference was held between the Education Committee of the Board of Governors of Toronto University and representatives of the Toronto Architectural Association and the Ontario Association of Architects. The latter organization had pre-

sented a bill to the committee asking their co-operation in having the provincial government undertake the examination of architects in the Province of Ontario. The whole subject was vaguely presented, but the bill apparently struck the University authorities as inadequate and undesirable. The wisdom of relegating to the provincial government (a body liable to periodical change in personnel and policy) the duty of setting a standard of education for the architectural profession seemed difficult for the Board of Governors to appreciate, and rightly so. Why should they be approached in the matter at all if they are merely to act as accessories to the Government? So great have been the powers acquired by the provincial University since its recent reorganization, and so pronounced the policy of the Ontario Government of entrusting to it all matters pertaining to higher education, that the Ontario Association of Architects would have acted wisely in turning over to the University the entire question of preparing courses of study and examination.

THERE was a rare opportunity at the annual banquet of the Ontario Association of Architects, held in the National Club on the evening of the 15th inst., for the educationist to make mental comparisons between past and present methods of imparting instruction, as illustrated by two speeches delivered there. The speakers were President Falconer of Toronto University and Mr. W. A. Langton. The latter was at no pains to conceal the fact that he considered, with pedagogues of a past generation, that the "club" was a necessity in educational work, whether elementary or advanced. "Behind the Ontario system," said he, "is the policeman with his club, metaphorically speaking, driving the children to school. And the law is what we must invoke if we are going to make unwilling young men train themselves properly to practise architecture. The only question is how. Force must be used in some way or the ordinary man will not present himself to be properly educated."

This premise, if modern educational research is to be relied upon, is a false one. If there is one thing more than another that modern educationists are shouting themselves hoarse about it is that all semblance of force or compulsion in educating the young be entirely abolished or so skilfully concealed in an attractive curriculum of studies that love of self-improvement rather than fear of the consequences entailed by its neglect shall be the incentive. It is lack of that very attractiveness, nay, lack of a curriculum of any kind, that has deterred architectural students in Ontario from striving to improve their professional education. It has been retorted that men won't study unless they have to. That hasn't proved so in the case of engineers at the School of Practical Science. It is not compulsory for engineers to take the University courses. It has simply become customary for young men intending to enter the engineering profession to attend the University for three or four years. The modern educational standard in that profession demands it, that is all. For architectural students there should be also a standard, and the University should set it.