

the expert held that no design could be considered which had not the full number of drawings called for, while he took into consideration designs which did not adhere to instructions, which all will agree should be adhered to by all competitors. He threw out designs because there was no perspective, or because the perspective was not finished—because the proper number of sections were not supplied, or because there were none, because one elevation was lacking or was not finished, &c. But he did not throw out designs because they did not follow the instructions as to requirements, which all designs should strictly follow. The design placed first has no vault "12 ft. x 18 ft. with door in end," nor does the Manager's security vault "open into the Manager's room or that of the Secretary." Many of the competitors devoted much time and trouble to arrange a plan which would fulfil these conditions, believing that they were binding upon them, and yet the expert who would not consider any design if all the drawings called for were not submitted, considers and places a design which does not carry out either of these instructions in first place, instead of throwing it out, as he should have done according to his own decision, even though he had not thrown out any design which did not have a full set of drawings. The result has been that the Association are now preparing to erect a building from a design which would have stood as low down as third, if not lower, provided the expert had been governed by precedent and common sense. It may be that he believed that the accepted design is the best, but if he does, we fail to understand on what grounds he bases that opinion. In the accepted design, the public, the officers and the clerks, are thrown together far too much to allow of the business of the Association being economically conducted. The public can wander into nearly every office of the Association without let or hindrance, and the clerks can go out to the public in like manner. How is a clerk to be controlled who can go out to the passages and corridors at any time in the day on the plea that he is going to the lavatory or lunch room. How will the female type-writers like passing through the public corridors whenever they are needed by any officer of the company? What is to prevent them having their friends in to see them at all hours of the day? Is the room for supplies in the most convenient place possible, and must the doors be kept continually locked to prevent the public from walking off with the contents? How will the medical officer like a room which will be comparatively dark at all times, and at an inconvenient distance from the Manager? Is it desirable to say the least, that the Secretary should be some distance from the Manager, etc., etc.? Faults exist in this plan which do not exist in more than one of those exhibited on the walls of the Canadian Institute. It is evident that if the plan selected is the best of those allowed to remain in the competition, those ruled out contained among their number the best designs which were submitted.

It would be instructive if the expert would explain on what grounds he rules out alternative elevations. There is not one word in the conditions stating that alternative elevations should not be sent in. What the conditions do say is: "Any of the competitors may send in a second set of drawings, embodying a different design, if he desires to do so; but in that case the second design must bear a different motto or cypher." That certainly does not mean that a competitor may not send in alternative elevations to a single plan. It does mean that when a competitor sends in two different designs they must not go in under the same motto. If the expert's ruling is correct, it would necessitate a competitor making duplicate drawings of his plans to accompany each alternative design or elevation, which is ridiculous, as any expert, even though he might be incomprehensibly dense, would at once see that they were all by the same man, and the object of using the motto would be defeated.

One great cause of complaint against the ordinary competition has been that the design would be judged by men without professional training and of no experience. It has been justly considered that no architect could be expected to prepare plans to be approved or rejected by incompetent judges. Many

architects have refused to have anything to do with competitions where an expert was not employed. But is it not possible that in the appointing of an expert a very great mistake can be made? The fact that an architect is appointed or will be appointed an expert in a competition may mean a great deal or very little. It is possible to find among men not in the profession as competent judges of architectural designs as many men who call themselves architects. If it is necessary that the expert should be a professional man—and we hold that it is—he should be a man from among the most able and intelligent of the profession, as it is not just to the best men that their work should be judged by inferior ability. The work of an expert is most difficult, and such that many men, although very capable professionally, are not competent to fill the position satisfactorily. No man should arrive at a decision in such an important matter as a competition by superficial means, but by carefully tabulated values. Likes and dislikes should be thrown aside, and a result arrived at by accurate and scientific means. In short, the examination of designs in a competition and the method of arriving at a decision, should become a science. A careful reading of the expert's report on the Confederation Life Assurance competition will explain what we mean. The reader will at once see that there is little of criticism of a professional character throughout the report. He will not find professional words or terms used, or professional reasons given anywhere in the report. It is exactly the kind of report which one would expect from an amateur follower of architecture. In the notes on the different plans sent in, there is no information of any value given. It all has the appearance of being put down because it was necessary to put down something; all points mentioned being superficial and of little account or value in arriving at a decision in such an important matter. Very often they are exceedingly contradictory, for we notice that one design is objected to because it has subsidiary offices on the greater portion of the two street fronts, and yet the accepted design has nothing but subsidiary offices on the Richmond street front with but one exception, and the main office, which is really a subsidiary office, on the Victoria street front. Many architects have found that any office in which a number of clerks are employed, should be removed from the street, as otherwise every disturbance in the street is an excuse for the entire staff to leave their work. The expert considered it very important that the Secretary should be able to command the space in front of the public counter. Why he should do so, it is difficult to say. The conditions do not state that his office must be so placed, but that it is to open off the public space, which is perfectly clear, as all parties having business with the Manager must pass through his room. It would seem from the opinion of the expert that it is a portion of the duties of the Secretary to keep an eye on every person doing business with the Association, that they may not get away with the assets or the building. The chief clerk in the main office can surely look after the clerks, so that the Secretary would not require to give them any attention. The expert has read the conditions where they state that the Managing-Director should be provided "with a retiring room and lavatory in addition," as meaning that he should be provided with a private room with a lavatory off same. He is justified in reading it that way; but as it can be read, and was read as meaning a toilet room, fitted with a w. c. and wash basin, he should not have held that those designs which did not furnish a private room for the special use of the Manager, had not complied with the conditions in such report.

We now propose to discuss the wording of the report to show that the expert did not give a proper amount of consideration in the deciding of the relative positions of the different designs. In speaking of the accepted design he says: "The design bearing the motto 'Lux' appeared to me to be in all respects the best, and for the following reasons, namely: All the instructions have been carried out and the drawings have been prepared with considerable skill, and fully express the intentions of the author." Now it has been shown that the instructions were not carried out, but instead very much departed from where they should have been strictly adhered to. A careful examination of