pittance which they received, but out of love for their art. They were not dependent on what they received; *they* were conferring the favor, and when they were treated as so many puppets who must obey the governing body or leave, they resigned with sad hearts, and left the school to the tender mercies of those whose Art knowledge is not sufficient to distinguish good Art from the wretched stuff which is put forward as artistic by those who are masquerading as artists. I do not know who the present teachers are; they may be thorough artists for all I know of them personally, but I do know that the work of their pupils is bad, wretchedly bad, and that is sufficient in my judgment to condemn them as incompetent. Copies or drawings of very inartistic work are supplied to the students. A copy of a good piece of wrought iron work, for instance, will cost no more than a copy of the worst piece of work that ever left the hands of a blacksmith. The fault must therefore be with those who select the copies, and they must be devoid of all artistic faculties, or they would be able to distinguish between copies of good and bad work.

That an attempt has been made to run the school under machine regulations is evident, and however well it may answer for the common schools of the country, it will not do in our Art Schools. The teachers must be allowed sufficient latitude to develop such courses of training as will interest their students in their work. There must be enthusiasm, for without it everything becomes dull, lifeless and discouraging.

I am of those who believe that more depends on the individual qualities of the teacher and the influence that he can bring to bear on the pupil to interest him in his work, than in any quantity of dull routine work done under set regulations, which kill all individuality and do not make allowance for the very different temperaments of the pupils. Is it any wonder that the Art Schools have suffered tremendously under such a system, and is it not possible that our common schools will likewise suffer? Teachers cannot be made to teach as if they were machines, without injuring them as men, and the system of which they are without doubt the most essential part, if not the whole. An attempt to teach with the object of giving practical training only, must always result in failure, where no instruction in general principles is given. Students should be taught in a manner that will broaden their views, make them reason, and thoroughly study the requirements of any work on which they may be engaged, that what they do may as nearly as possible fulfil the conditions. Nothing good can result when a student is hurried along on superficial instruction in special designing, even though it may be very practical. He will almost to a certainty do any designing which he may attempt along mechanical lines, not having had his reasoning faculties expanded by instruction in the principles he should follow, while leaving him free to exert his individuality. All instructions and training should be with the object of developing the individual without sacrificing his individuality. There is sufficient machinery in the world at present, and if not, more can be manufactured. It is not necessary, therefore, to train members of the human race down to the grade of machinery—for too many are now, of their own free will, machines to all intents and purposes. It may be necessary to give some mechanical training to certain classes, but certainly not to students who are to be the designers of the future, more especially if their work is to be artistic, and consequently refining and ennobling.

I am not opposed to Industrial Schools; in fact I am a strong supporters of them, but I desire to support schools which are truly industrial, and not something else. The sort of industrial training which should be encouraged is the teaching of drawing to such an extent that the pupils of the school will be both able to understand drawings of work which they may be called upon to execute, and make drawings of any work—where drawings are not supplied—and they will facilitate the execution of the work. I do not believe that it is the duty of the Government to make the pupil a trained artisan in any particular calling. If the Government will give a good foundational course of training that will start the student in the right course to perfect himself in his chosen calling, it is doing all that any Government should do. If the means are supplied whereby the student can gain the information necessary to him, he should be called upon to make some effort for the enrichment of himself in the knowledge of his trade or art. That a school such as we possess, or for that matter, any school, can be made to turn out competent designers, is impossible. The time necessary for such perfection would be badly spent indeed, if spent in a school, no matter how good. A man will learn ten times more in one year at his trade or art in the workshop, than he will in the same time spent at any school, provided he has first the knowledge which it is the place of an industrial school to impart. The designing taught at schools where they strive to be very "practical," is such that the student must unlearn it before he will be of any service in the manufactory. It is mechanical to a degree that is simply ruinous to anything like good work. It is a thousand times better to teach the principles of design and the different methods of artistic expression, than to attempt the impossible and strive to turn out what are called "practical designers." If turned out at all, they will be like so many machines—their designs will be lifeless, inartistic and valueless, but very possibly not harmless, as some may be lead to look upon them as the production of artistic training, and consequently to be admired.

There is nothing gained by attempting much and failing; more benefit will result from attempting little and doing that little well and along correct lines. One good teacher is better for a school than ten or any number of inferior ones; but above all things, the principal teacher should be capable and enthusiastic. An incapable at the head of an institution will be its ruin, and that, I believe is the position of the Toronto School of Art.

Where are all the capable teachers that were once in this school Gone? And why? Because they were lovers of Art and not mechanical puppits willing and ready to jump at the command of "practical" ignorance, incapacity and conceit. There is such a thing as being so practical, as well as so artistic, that nothing good or beneficial results. Is it not better to err on the artistic, poetical and pleasurable side of life, than on the practical, the mechanical and gloomy side? Will not the human race be better with a little more joy and happiness, than with more energy and drive? Does not the great wealth of the few, and the abject poverty of the many, prove that there is too much hard-headedness and energy, and too little kindly consideration one for the other, and desire to give and obtain happiness? Would it not be better to seek knowledge to gain contentment and refinement, than to gain wealth and the pride of wealth.

After all, would it not be better to teach Art in an Art School for its refining influence, rather than attempt to train pupils who are indifferent to their future some specialty that they may gain a livelihood? Would it not be better to have industrial classes to teach the hard and dry knowledge required by mechanics in a way that will be useful to them, without any pretence of teaching them something else?

We want both Art Schools and Industrial Classes conducted by those who have a knowledge of the work entrusted to them. What we do not want are Art Schools degraded until they do not teach art, and too important in their own conceit to give industrial training that will be of service to the mechanical classes.

The Toronto Art School must be taken from under the wing of the Education Department and allowed to breathe the air of independence. The freer the Art Schools of the Province are, the better the work they do, The one at Ottawa, from all accounts, leads the Art Schools of the Province; and we understand that there the Minister of Education was not allowed to interfere with its management. If he had been, the Toronto school might not now be the most inefficient in the Province. The Toronto school should be placed under the management of men having some artistic training, and who will have sufficient firmness to resist all efforts which may be made to effect its ruin under any and all disguises. Teachers should be selected who have a knowledge of Art, and are capable of teaching it. If without certificates from Art Schools, so much the better. There have been too many teachers in the past with certificates from schools of somewhat similar standing to the Toronto school, for its good. Teachers without certificates, but with artistic ability, would be a change, and should work wonders. Let us try this innovation.

I am glad to see that some members of this year's Board of Directors have come to the conclusion that they are not the men to manage an Art School without the assistance of the artistic talent of the city. There are many good men on the Board of Management, but they have not the information nor experience necessary to successfully control an Art School. The direct management of the school should rest with a committee of artists, but there should be a general board, with many interests represented, to control the committee and provide funds for the proper working of the school. I am not confident that this will come to pass—I hope it will—but such a radical change will not meet with the approval of the Minister of Education, as he insists on being the controlling power in all things, both great and small.

Let us hope that the men now on the Managing Board who recognize that the school is not what it should be, will not cease their efforts of reform until they have relieved the school of the load of official incapacity which has weighed it down into the mire of utter uselessness.

Yours truly,

ANTIPATHY.

STONE-CARVING.

A great deal of the ornamental stone-work, which has been done in some of our best building in recent years, has been cut after the stone was in position. This is common, indeed, in the larger cities. Within a short time this process was rare. We can remember in 1873 that in Boston the practice was only then coming into general use. It was introduced by a number of architects who had studied abroad. At that time in a number of cases it was more of a fad than a necessity as considerable stone cutting was done in the building which might better have been done elsewhere. But as the general character of the design changed, work of this kind became more rational. Though in some cases, as at the present time, it was carried to an unwarrantable extent. The practice of stone-carving was probably developed most fully in France, where an extended use is made of the soft Caens stone. There the moldings, as well as the more ornamental carved and decorative portions are worked out on the building. It is quite absurd to do this to its fullest extent in the case of granite, hard limestone and even brown sandstone, as was done to a certain extent in the East several years ago. Certain carved and highly decorative portions can best be done after the building has been finished otherwise. But a mere mania for imitating foreign methods, without the exercise of reason, is absurd indeed. Some of the foreign methods of building are better than ours. Some of them are not so good. If we can only use sense enough to discriminate we will be fortunate indeed. The extremes of patriotism or mania for foreign imitation are alike unsatisfactory. We remember a visit to Trinity College at Hartford, a few years ago. They had some very beautiful buildings after the designs of Mr. Burges, the English architect. They have his work in all its beauty, but they had not imported the English climate; they had the same old New England climate with English windows, sashes and English grates. We were in a number of student's rooms and found them cold and miserable. There is nothing better than the American windows for the Northern American climate, particularly that of the colder portion. The English windows are suited to the English people and their climate. This illustration is used for the purpose of its general application in all details of building work. In the matter of stone-carving there is no need of doing it in the building merely because some one else does it. It may be done because there is a good reason for it. Under certain conditions the reason may not exist. Mere imitation is a sign of decadence.—*Stone.*

Wood may be inlaid with other woods, with bone, ivory, tortoise-shell, mother-of-pearl, and other shells, with metals, with marbles, with precious stones, with glass, pottery, china, or enamel, either plain or in pattern, says Prof. G. Aitchison, A. R. A., in a lecture on decoration before the society of arts, London. Living as most of us do in hired houses, we hardly think of anything but painted deal, the painting being renewed every few years, according to the caprices of fashion. Modern inlaid woodwork most of us have never seen; what we take for it is marquetry—two veneers of different colors cut into the pattern wanted, and one fitted into the other, and the whole glued on to a backing. Inlaying is sinking out the solid wood and letting in pieces of other colored materials, and requires much greater care and skill than marquetry. There are said to be only five men in England who are first-rate at marquetry, and most of them are foreigners. The main merit of real inlay is this, that at the worst the inlay can but come out, while veneer, if it gets damp, or if the glue gets too dry, comes off bodily. Very few people appreciate the value of hard wood, which has the incidental merit of not bruising so easily as soft; but its main merit is preserving the decorative color originally designed, and that it can be inlaid, or if carved, is not spoiled by successive painting. Oak is mostly our highest ambition. The mediævals and the people of the last century were quite right to plaster and paint, or to gild it, for new oak is one of the vilest colors—a sort of cross between cold veal and a top-boot. If not French polished, it may get a decent color in the days of your great-grand-children, though when new it does not make a bad background for inlays of ebony, other colored woods, and ivory. Spanish mahogany also looks well when it is about a century old, and is then a blackish purple. For dignity nothing is so serviceable as ebony, or wood stained black. Ebony varying from black, through brown to yellow, or through grey to black, has the inestimable advantage of variety, which dyed wood mostly wants. In this respect it is like real black marble, that is rarely without variations to gray or brown, and more often then not has white flecks or veins in it, so that you do not mistake it for enameled iron or slate. [Specimens of marquetry shown.] The parquetry of floors may be equally well inlaid in patterns, only it wants to be done on a larger scale.

HINTS ON VENTILATION.

IN ventilating—say a bed room—by means of the window, what you may principally want is an upword blowing current. Well, there are several methods of securing this without danger of a draught:

1. Holes may be bored in the lower part of the upper sash of the window, admitting the outside air.

2. Right across one foot of the lower sash, but attached to the immovable frame of the window, may be hung or tacked a piece of strong Willesden paper—prettily painted with flowers and birds if you please. The window may then be raised to the extent of the breadth of this paper, and the air rushes upward between the two sashes.

3. The same effect is got from simply having a board about six inches wide and the exact size of the sash's breadth. Use this to hold the window up.

4. This same board may have two bent or elbow tubes in it, opening upwards and into the room, so that the air coming through does not blow directly in. The inside openings may be protected by valves, and thus the amount of incoming current can be regulated. We thus get a circulating movement of the air, as, the window being raised, there is an opening between the sashes.

5. In summer a frame half as big as the lower sash may be made of perforated zinc or wire gauze and placed in so as to keep the window up. There is no draught; and if kept in position all night, then, as a rule, the inmate will enjoy refreshing sleep.

6. In addition to these plans, the door of every bed room should possess at the top thereof a ventilating panel, the simplest of all being that formed of wire gauze.

In conclusion let me again beg of you to value fresh air as you value life and health itself; while taking care not to sleep directly in an appreciable draught, to abjure curtains all round the bed. A curtained bed is only a stable for nightmares and a hotel for a hundred wonderills and ailments.—*Cassell's Magazine.*