OUR ILLUSTRATIONS.

PROPOSED NEW Y. M. C. A. BUILDING, KINGSTON, ONT.—J. B. REID AND ARTHUR ELLIS, ARCHITECTS, KINGSTON.

The materials will be brick, with rock-face stone trimmings. The interior finish will be plain, but of good quality.

SKETCH FOR AGED WOMEN'S HOME, IN BELMONT STREET, TORONTO.—WM. R. GREGG, ARCHITECT.

The materials to be used in the construction are: red brick, with Ohio stone trimmings. The basement contains kitchen, laundry, boiler room, root cellar, etc. In the attic are bedrooms, storage rooms and bath room.

ENTRANCE TO RESIDENCE OF MR. GEO. G. BOOTH, TRUMBULL AVENUE, DETROIT, MICH.—CARVED IN PORTAGE ENTRY RED SAND STONE.

HOUSES ON BRUNSWICK AVE., TORONTO—E. B. JARVIS, ARCHITECT, TORONTO.

THE ONTARIO ARCHITECTS' ACT.

The *Australasian Builder* in an article on "The Registration of Architects," expresses its opinion of the Ontario Architects' Act in the following terms:

"And now let us turn to the Canadian doings. Setting aside a great deal of technical machinery for the carrying into effect of the principles of legislation, either enacted or desired—matters which eminently concern the parliamentary draughtsmen and the lawyers, but scarcely the architectural press—we find the variations made by the Parliament of Ontario, in the "Ontario Architects' Act," from the provisions put forward by the Ontario Association of Architects in their draft Bill, to be all in the direction of public freedom and liberty of action. But, whereas the very object of the incorporation or registration of professional bodies is to place a salutary check, in the interests of the public, on such extremely latitudinarian liberty, or license, the emendations made by the Ontario Legislature are partly beneficial and partly the reverse. In the former category may be placed the rejection of the provision for a two years' practice of architecture previous to the passing of the Act, as an essential condition of registration, and the recognition of a shorter term of articles than five years when the indenture was made before the passing of the Act; the permission given to the student, under certain conditions, in clause 24 (3), to serve a portion of his time with an architect during the vacations of the School of Architecture (by which he would probably save a year); the indulgence for registration in cases of illness, absence, or inadvertence; the legal allowance of the same fees to architects as are paid to land surveyors, when attending any court as witnesses; and the provisions contained in clause 30 (3) for prosecution under the Act. The omissions from the draft Bill, however, made in the Act are far more prejudicial than the provisions we have just alluded to can be of benefit. The deprivation of the Council of the proposed powers to dispense, in special cases, with their ordinary rules, &c., is a needless dictation of hard-and-fast procedure entangled in red-tape; but of far greater moment is the omission of clause 26 of the draft Bill. At the risk of appearing undemocratic in this ultra-democratic country, we feel called upon to maintain most strongly the paramount importance of drafting into not alone the architectural profession, but into all professions (as distinguished from mere trades), lads only who can show that they have received a fairly liberal education, and who may, therefore, be presumed to possess at least the rudiments of culture and some of the first instincts of a gentleman. While we strongly advocate the recognition for the nonce of the *status quo* in the profession, we still more strongly plead for the most jealous guarding of its gates from ignorance and snobbery in days to come.

But there are other omissions from the Act, of no less grave importance. One of these is the draft provision that only registered architects should be able to recover charges in a court of law. If a Registration Act is to be anything at all, it should be a reality, and not a farce. And, therefore, this very provision would indirectly be one of the heaviest penalties for non-registration that could be devised, and would do more than anything else to bring public discredit on the unregistered (because incompetent) architect. To very much the same effect is the omission of the draft clauses 35, 38, and 47. If it be understood that all competent architects are registered—and this certainly is the view held by most of the genuine advocates of registration—but if, all the same, unregistered architects—"Dick, Tom, or Harry"—may be appointed by public bodies to very important and responsible public offices; if valid certificates may be granted by unregistered men; and if the Council be deprived of the power to cancel the registration of an architect convicted of felony or misdemeanor, or even "of conduct infamous in a professional respect," what becomes of the safeguards to the public, what of the honor of the profession? It seems to us that by their rejection of these clauses the Ontario Parliament have stultified and rendered almost nugatory an Act that in many respects is admirable; and this course surprises us the more because of their rejection of Clause 36. The inclusion of this clause would have provided a salutary check upon the rapacity of unprincipled architects, by restricting them (except by special arrangement) to the maximum as well as the minimum charges laid down in the tariff of the Ontario Association. The professional charges formulated by most of the leading architectural bodies throughout the English-speaking world are now so fair and equitable as between architect and client, that the public, as well as the profession, should be protected from imposition, and justice should be meted equally to both parties. In conclusion, we have only to express a hope that the Ontario architects will succeed in soon obtaining from their Legislature an amending Act, and that our architectural friends in Melbourne and Victoria generally will give the various matters we have placed before our readers their careful consideration, with the view of making the Victorian Registration Bill, whenever it becomes law, as perfect, just and workable a measure as is possible.

MANUAL AND TECHNICAL TRAINING OF ARCHITECTS AND ENGINEERS.*

KNOWING that many things in the early education of architects and engineers need much reform, I will endeavor to point them out in the clearest possible form, and would remind you that, although these are my humble opinions, they are based upon much experience of the practical working man, and the theoretical and practical architect and engineer. That it is necessary for the architect or engineer, as the case may be, to have done some actual work at one or more trades connected with his calling or profession, you may admit, although I can hardly hope to make you or *myself* believe that he shall necessarily be an expert, for if he does justice to the other part of his profession, I hardly think that that is attainable. But judging from some of our young architects of note, over the border, who have recently been gaining honors in the old world, you will see that even an architect can be a skilful artisan, or shall I say an artisan can become an architect. . . . . Do you wonder at the number of unemployed draftsmen or at the low wages paid to a great many, when such cases as the following occur: A tradesman, or someone of limited means, wishes to article his boy (who has shown an aptitude for drawing) with an architect, and pays a premium. No wages are paid, of course, for three years or more. After a little picture-making on the part of the boy, the father knows a man who wants to put up a pair of shops, a cottage, or some other building, and does not want to waste money over an architect. He knows what he wants, and the boy knows what he has done in the office, for which his employer has charged 10 guineas; why, he will do it for £3, or say £2 to secure the job, and as no local board exist, these wretched botches of buildings meet your eyes in every suburban street. No supervision of the building is necessary—the Building Society's surveyor does that when the Society makes progress payment; do you wonder these buildings sometimes fall and kill somebody, and that jerry builders and jerry architects exist? This is how they are made. It is high time that some legal protection was given to the profession, and one of the things that will do most to help it is a higher standard and better education among ourselves. . . . Granted the hand becomes a little unsteady through work, it is more than compensated for by the practical knowledge gained and the respect ensured from the artisan and builder who work under him (the architect). It is as the president of the kindred Association of New South Wales pointed out: the brain-worker must gain more practical knowledge. The hand-workers are already in the field gaining more theoretical knowledge, cultivating the sciences and arts that pertain to their trades and callings. And the same field—thanks to some noble benefactors and a liberal Government—is open to you likewise. The advancement and enlightenment of the artisan does not mean less respect and deference to the architect, unless you wilfully waste your time and opportunities. What artisan can respect glaring ignorance on the part of the master-mind? If the designer of the work show gross ignorance in construction, it places him to a great extent in the power of the builder. A bad drawing from the office soon gets known all over the building. The foreman gets out of temper with it, and the workman gets hold of it: his *practical knowledge* is doing the work, and the respect and love due to the architect vanish. I think one of the first things necessary is that more attention should be paid to the groundwork of the pupil. To begin with, he should be a good writer, a fair arithmetician; then he should have a knowledge of decimals, fractions, square and cube root, and mensuration, be able to work out a simple equation in algebra, and be conversant with at least the first three books of Euclid; he should have a knowledge of practical, plane, and solid geometry, and free hand drawing, elementary physics, practical mechanics, and elementary chemistry. Many, I know, are in favor of the pupil going to a builder for a few years. But I think in these days, when University workshops, and technical schools and colleges are in every large town, this (shall I say waste of money?) can to a great extent be dispensed with. He can learn to make the various joints in carpentry and plumbing; to lay brick and mortar; to work stone at the banker; model in clay, take casts; work in iron from forge to lathe; learn to carve in wood or stone. Building construction, architecture, theoretical and applied mechanics, all are taught, not merely in theory only, but the laboratory and workshops are replete with all conveniences for practical manual work, under the superintendence of professors in each branch. Truly, gentlemen, with these advantages to your hand, you can mould the pupil of the future to your wish. A knowledge of tools and construction is indispensible to all, to say nothing of what is gained in health by their use after stooping all day over the drawing table or writing desk. Another thing I think both architects and engineers err in—their pupils do not see enough of the jobs. They should be sent at all convenient times to assist in supervising the digging out of the trenches and excavations; to see that the fall and levels for drains are correct, the joints in the earthenware pipes made. I dare say many will smile at this,

* From a paper read before the Architectural and Engineering Association of Victoria, by B. F. Storer, April 20th, 1891, and published in the *Australasian Builder*.