

STUDENTS' DEPARTMENT.

C. A. & B. COMPETITION FOR A DRUG STORE.

This is not a very satisfactory competition. The competitors have interpreted the conditions liberally in various directions and have not in spite of this presented as good designs as might have been expected.

"Italia" is without doubt the first. Considering the limited space at his disposal, too much has been made of the dispensary. The space left for customers between the counter and the show window is barely five feet. The second step at the shop door is a serious mistake, and the shop entrance door is too small. The arrangement of the dwelling place and its separation from the shop so as to secure without awkwardness the independence of each, is well managed, and the free communication from kitchen to cellar an excellent idea. But the sizes of the rooms in the dwelling house will not bear too close inspection. An extremely small kitchen is not impossible for use and has even a point in its favour, but an extremely small dining room has nothing that can be said for it, particularly when it is on the wrong side of the house. The dining room should have taken the place of the parlour and been brought out to the hall line. It would then have been sufficiently wide, though still only 11 feet, and would get the eastern instead of the western sun. The parlour would then be the smaller room and we may suppose it a reception room and the dining room to be the family living room. At the bottom of this difficulty is the external centralization of the front windows on the first floor which was quite unnecessary either for an Italian effect or to relieve the beam over the shop window, which latter end indeed is not achieved. The fenestration of first floor should be arranged to suit the rooms inside and then there would be no need of the elliptical windows in which the designer has taken refuge. Had the chimney been placed on the north wall instead of on the east it might have been used to give a better finish to the north wall. "Italia's" design, though it requires a good deal of criticism, is worth criticism. The others are not only less worth criticism but from the scantiness of the drawings furnished with the best of them give less opportunity for it.

Between "Toledo," "Eros" and "Pill Box" it has been necessary to discriminate by a careful comparison of points. As a result it seems best to give the second place to "Toledo" and the third to "Eros."

"Toledo" has placed a good example before him, and though his efforts between the lintel of the shop window and the cornice storey are misdirected the result though defective in design is not offensive to the taste.

"Eros" has managed to reduce the apparent height of his shop window without reducing the light or opportunity of display. In general taste and design he has a slight advantage over "Pill Box" and is therefore placed third.

"Pillbox" makes a neat drawing though in this as well as in his design he is perhaps not following the best examples. His design is at the bottom common enough and he can only get away from it by enrichments which are inappropriate and only land him in bad taste.

"H2 SO4" also deserves mention rather from the neatness of his drawing than from any solid merit in his somewhat showy design.

"Windsor" is strictly commonplace and apparently makes no effort after a truer kind of design.

"Builder" and "Canadian" are too fantastic both in plan and elevation.

The author of the design signed "Italia" which has been awarded first position, is Mr. J. Melville Millar, Montreal. The design signed "Toledo" awarded second position, is by Mr. Walter Siddall, Toronto. "Eros," who has been placed third would oblige by forwarding his name and address to the editor, as it has seemingly been mislaid.—Ed. C. A. & B.]

STUDENTS' NEGLIGENCE.

It has been remarked in connection with the training of our rising architects, and very truly too, that they have not the advantages that their confreres in England have. By these "advantages," generally speaking, is meant, ancient buildings, the use of libraries and a general higher tone of art in all their surroundings, than is possible in a young country. But there is one particular advantage, that by most students, themselves, here, would be regarded as a disadvantage, but which in after years they may come to regret very much they were without in their younger years. It is simply this, that students of professions in England must pay for their education, instead of, as here, being paid while they acquire it.

Let us for a moment compare the ways in which the two systems work. The principal who takes a pupil in England receives a premium, in return for which he gives a portion of his time to the youth and puts within his reach such practical information as he may gather for himself from visits to the works in progress, and again the pupil desires to make the most of his time and to profit by the opportunities put in his way. He does not hesitate to ask for information, because it is his right to receive it, and he is paying for it, and the more questions asked, the

more there are to ask, because in no way does the eye of the mind become more effectually opened than by questions.

Here, the principal, who has to pay his pupils while he is trying to make them worth their pay, is placed at an immense and unfair disadvantage. The student, in general, thinks more about his pay than acquiring knowledge, and as has been shown over and over again by our students, do what you will to help them in their studies, not ten per cent. of them show any desire to profit by your actions on their behalf outside their office hours.

Students' Architectural Clubs have been started over and over again by the real, bona fide students; every one has died an untimely death, and the cause of the decease has not been entirely owing to the departure of their worthy fellows for wider spheres of work and experience. It has been because there were none to take their places, and keep up the weekly meetings—none who would, for their sole advantage, respond to the efforts of the many practising architects who took the trouble to prepare lectures and to go down and deliver them at no small sacrifice to themselves, to the two or three earnest young men bound on progressing, and the empty chairs of a couple of dozen who ought to have been there. Many a time has it been said to these students, "Why do you not ask questions?" It is not possible, in a lecture, that the subject should be fully explained to every quality of mind in the hearers; some part or other must require further elucidation to make it clearer to this or that one, and so on, but from our experience, despite all the opportunities given, we might say that at least half of the students who have had these advantages, never asked a single question. Had they had the advantage of paying good round sums for their professional training, we would guarantee they would be more eager to help themselves; and as to those in the past, so with those in the present, a time will come when they will one and all say, "How unfortunate it is that I was not forced to make more of my time as a student:—daily I neglected opportunities because I did not see the advantages, and was not forced in any way to use them."

The results of the annual examinations bear out the same facts. The majority of the students who present themselves come up utterly unprepared, and instead of the majority passing, it is the minority only who are successful. We would warn students that these are days in which only the thoroughly proficient can make even a living out of his profession; the competition is overwhelming; he who starts on the battle of life unqualified must succumb, and if he does, he has only himself to thank or to blame. It is to be feared that few of the present generation of students will make any mark in the world when they go out from us, and as long as they work only for their pay, there will be little improvement in the race.

INTERCOMMUNICATION COLUMN.

This column is intended to afford a means of correspondence for students, builders and all our readers desiring information they cannot otherwise obtain. Questions for which an immediate reply is required should be marked "Urgent." Names and addresses of correspondents must be sent with their communications, but these may be signed with initials or otherwise for publication.

QUESTIONS.

[19]. I should be obliged if you could tell me the strength of wire ropes as compared with ordinary hemp ropes. I notice that contractors in town use wire ropes a great deal in large buildings for guys and such purposes.—"Country Builder."

REPLIES.

[14]. "Aspirant,"—You might carry up your column to a height of 700 ft. with perfect safety. Average sandstone weighs about 145 lbs. per cubic foot and would require a vertical column of 4158 ft. high to crush the base stones, but they might crack under a column about half that height. It is safer not to trust to more than 700 ft., or from one-sixth to one-tenth the crushing height.—"Science."

[16]. "Frosty,"—The weight of snow, fresh fallen, is from 5 to 12 lbs. per cubic foot. A cubic foot of water weighs a little over 64 lbs. "Frosty" can therefore see, that if his snow will lie until it thaws, and his roof has to support water, he must allow for an increase of weight of from 50 lbs. to 57 lbs., according to the depth of the snow water likely to stand on the roof. For ordinary purposes, for snow moistened and compact by rain, allow from 15 to 20 lbs. per cubic foot.

[17].—"J. L. T."—Trautwine (Edit. of 1886) p 397, gives a description of the making of a sun-dial. It is too long to give here, but if you cannot get hold of the book we will endeavor at some future time to publish it.—ED. INT. COL.]

[18] "Predicament."—We should require further particulars before we could answer your question. Your site is unusual, therefore a general answer would not suit your case. Let us know the kind of building you intend to erect, and also give a more detailed statement of the nature of the clay.—"M. P."

The following students were granted certificates of proficiency in architectural drawing at the recent examinations of the Toronto Technical school:—W. Bell, J. Michael, C. McPherson, W. R. Bale, E. Stanton.