

to hear proposals for such amendments.

Mr. A. C. Hutchison moved a resolution to oppose the Canadian Institute in any endeavor to obtain legislation which would encroach on the rights of the P. Q. A. A. Mr. Doran seconded. Mr. Maxwell intimated that if the resolution were lost he would propose a modification. Mr. Hutchison's motion being voted on and lost, Mr. Maxwell's amendment was adopted by 8 votes to 10. It read as follows: "Resolved, that we consider that the charter of the Canadian Institute of Architects, while expressing a splendid conception, is not so worded as to sufficiently protect our rights, and that the council be instructed to take legal advice and see that our rights are safeguarded in every detail."

COMMUNICATION.

To the Editor of

THE CANADIAN ARCHITECT AND BUILDER.

Dear Sir,—In your December number, in a report of the annual meeting of the Architectural Club, you print a resolution of the Club on the question of the registration of architects in which it is said that the club "is opposed to the form or forms of registration put forth by the Institute of Architects of Canada and the Ontario Association of Architects, which would mean giving the control of the profession over into the hands of certain privileged bodies of the profession."

The Institute of Architects of Canada was started in Montreal, and is, I believe, aiming at a constitution of the same kind as that of the Province of Quebec Association of Architects, to which the architects of Montreal are accustomed. If they are in error, I do not wish to defend them; I write only to remove a misapprehension as to the attitude of the Ontario Association towards this question.

It is true that, when this Association first started, its constitution was modeled, on the suggestion, I believe, of the then Minister of Education, on that of the Law Society. Members of the Association were to have an exclusive title, the right to which was to be obtained by passing examinations conducted by the Association.

The purpose of this Act was to oblige young men to train themselves properly for the profession. It failed in this respect, inasmuch as the title of members of the Association was made not "Architect" but "Registered Architect."

When it was clear that the Act as it stood would have no effect upon the educational question, the Association (with whom also the title "Registered Architect" was not popular), represented the state of affairs to the Government and requested that the title be made "Architect."

A bill for this purpose was accordingly put into the hands of a member on the Government side to test the feeling of the House. The feeling of a majority of the House appeared to be in favor of the results aimed at by the bill; but it became clear in committee that there was opposition in the country; not of a statesmanlike character, but an opposition which the committee would not go against.

In its practical bearing upon our question the opposition amounted to a suspicion that if the Association had the power to conduct the examinations by which young men were admitted to practise architecture, it would use that power to refuse them admittance and keep them out of practice. Accordingly, when we brought the question up again in the House, we expressed our readiness to hand over the duty of examination to agents appointed by the Government.

In this form the opposition to the bill, as class legislation, was withdrawn. It did not, however, pass, because of opposition from two architects on the ground that an annual fee should not be made a condition of practice.

This was in 1897, and since that date examination by government agency may be defined as the attitude of the Association to the question of an educational test for persons intending to practise architecture.

At the convention held in January, 1907, it was proposed to bring the matter up again, and the question of how to conduct examinations apart from the Association is now, at the request of the Association, being considered by the Ontario Government.

This position, unless I am very much mistaken, is the very position in favor of which the Toronto Architectural Club "wishes to put itself on record," in proposing the above motion. This is a "form of registration of architects, based on education and under direct Government control which the resolution calls "a proper form."

We may therefore, I suppose, count on the support of the Toronto Architectural Club if a measure to that effect is introduced this session.

Yours truly,

W. A. LANGTON,

43 Victoria St., Toronto, Jan. 11.

NEW ARCHITECTURAL FIRMS.

A new architectural firm have opened offices in the Calthorpe Building, 619 Hastings street, Vancouver, B. C., under the firm name of Wright & MacDonald. These gentlemen come to the terminal city after long architectural experience in the old country. Mr. Robert J. MacDonald comes from Inverness, Scotland, where he served his apprenticeship in the offices of Ross & McBeth and afterwards with Hippolyte Blanc, of Edinburgh. Later he was identified with architectural firms in London, notably those of Frederick Arthur, and Ernest Taylor. Coming to Canada about sixteen months ago, he became connected with the government architectural office at Edmonton, removing from there to Vancouver last August. Mr. MacDonald is a nephew of the late sir Hector MacDonald.

Mr. Edmund Wright is a Royal Academy gold medalist, and an A.R.I.B.A., having served his apprenticeship in Leeds. Later, coming to Canada, he too entered the Government architectural offices at Edmonton.

Architect Herbert B. Rugh has taken into partnership Andrew J. Riddell, C.E., architect, late of Glasgow. The name of the new firm is Rugh & Riddell, with offices at 926-927 Union Bank Building, Winnipeg.