

the quantities taken from the plans and specifications by skilled "quantity surveyors," paid by the owner, and the contractor making his estimate on these quantities, instead of each contractor taking off his own quantities and making his estimate thereon, was a very good one, which must result in the advancement of good architecture, and he would like to see the system introduced in this country. It had been shown by Mr. Siddall that the man who worked hardest in the monetary interest of his client was the one who received the least remuneration; that was the first logical argument he had ever heard adduced against the percentage system. He understood it was now the case in England that a number of the leading architects were receiving stated sums in payment for their services in carrying out buildings, instead of working on a percentage commission. He agreed with Mr. Darling that every man had a right to set his own scale of charges for services rendered, and, as a rule, he thought the public were pretty well satisfied that architects were not over paid. He had great pleasure in moving a vote of thanks to Mr. Siddall for his excellent paper.

Mr. Burke said one could not take a walk through the newer parts of Toronto without being impressed by the large number of houses of a class designed simply to catch the public eye. He thought it might be said that three-quarters of the houses recently put up were simply houses copied from others of the same type. In his own practice he was continually meeting with people who admired this or that house because of some feature not at all in accord with true architecture, but which for some inexplicable reason seemed to gratify a certain fancy of the public. You would find perhaps windows of half a dozen different styles in one front, and features introduced without any logical sequence at all, simply to gratify and catch the taste of clients of that class. This all made it very difficult for an architect who desired to design in a simple, logical and dignified form to obtain work. With regard to the question of detail, that was a very serious problem for the architect of to-day. As Mr. Dick had remarked, so much attendance had to be given to superintendence, that without burning the midnight oil, there was little time in which to cultivate design. Referring to the question of fees, he doubted whether under the existing conditions, any system more satisfactory than the present system of fees could be devised. There was one phase of this question, however, which he thought presented difficulty. In one case a man might have an easy going client, who made no bargain about fees, but left the architect to charge whatever he thought was the value of his services. In another case the client might be a hard bargainer, one who would say, "Well, if you won't do it at this rate I can get someone who will." Now, was it right to charge one man 5% for the same class of work which under pressure like that you would accept 4% for from another man, simply because one was a hard bargainer and the other a man content to let it go in the usual way? Yet an architect who was conscientious was driven to accept uniformly a less remuneration than his services were really worth, or else, on the other hand, ran the risk of losing clients and work.

The President noted that nearly every speaker had touched upon the main principle in all good design, the correct solving of the problem presented, and that problem included every consideration that arose in each

case, the matter of good and bad taste, the requirements of the client, the money consideration, the nature of the site, and everything else connected with the proposed building. He thought too much stress could not be laid on the necessity of approaching work with that thought in mind.

The vote of thanks to Mr. Siddall, having been seconded by Mr. Wickson, was then carried.

Mr. Siddall, in acknowledging the thanks tendered him, said there were one or two points that had arisen during the discussion of which he would like to say a word or two. It had been remarked by Mr. Wickson that the careful conscientious architect would get his reward by the increased patronage that would accrue to him. It was doubtful if that was an unmixed blessing, for he thought one cause of trouble was that architects undertook too much work, more than they were faithfully able to carry out in the way he thought it should be carried out. If they could undertake less work, getting for it proper remuneration, it would go a long way towards obviating many of the existing drawbacks, such as the impossibility of designing details in all the work. He thought a great deal of the working out of the details should be done on the building, a plan that was followed by some of the best English architects and might with benefit be adopted here, because there one had the whole thing before him, and could form more correct ideas as to proportion.

Mr. Burke pointed out what he considered the impracticability of the course suggested by Mr. Siddall. An architect here, if he desired to keep abreast of the times, must have all his working plans and details matured before the foundation of the building was finished, and the details of his interior work in the hands of the carpenter before the roof was on.

ONTARIO ASSOCIATION OF ARCHITECTS.

THE examinations of the Association will begin on the 13th of March next. Students wishing to enter for the examinations should send in their names to the Registrar.

The various propositions made in convention for the improvement of the Association are being considered by the consulting committee appointed at the convention. The committee has had two meetings with the Toronto members of the Council, and there is no doubt that some of the propositions that are brought before it—if not all—will be found feasible. It will be necessary to submit the result of these deliberations to a full meeting of the Council, and finally to the next convention; then, as the way is already prepared for them by a notice of motion, they may become law at once.

The Toronto Chapter met on Monday evening, the 13th, to hear Mr. W. L. Symons give his paper on "New Problems in Architecture," which circumstances prevented him from giving at the convention. The paper dealt chiefly with the new method of practising made necessary by the diversity of the operations required by modern architecture, and was a strong and practical argument in favor of the employment by architects of specialists to work out the details of important construction, and even of heating, sanitation, etc., when these details are so extensive as to engross the attention of the architect to the exclusion of architecture proper. Mr. Symons argued that if a specialist can do any portion of the work better than the architect, it is the architect's duty to his clients to employ him; and he pointed out that not only is it a gain to the architect himself to have these so-called "practical" parts of the work well done, but in setting his mind free to attend to design it enables him to devote himself to that by which his practice stands or falls; for it is always to be observed that when an architect begins to neglect his design by giving his own attention chiefly to practical affairs, his practice begins to fall off.

The audience for this paper consisted of Messrs. Grant Helliwell, C. H. C. Wright, W. R. Gregg, W. A. Langton, F. S. Baker, G. R. Harper and J. Wilson Gray.