

for the courtesy and the valuable assistance he has rendered us. That we honour him for the glorious fight he is making in the cause of Registration, and heartily wish him the fullest success in his efforts."

Mr. Darling seconded the motion, which was adopted.

The Chairman announced that the business of the convention would be conducted strictly in accordance with Parliamentary rule.

ORANGE, N. J., SEWAGE FARM.

Mr. D. B. Dick read an interesting paper on "The Orange, N. J., Sewage Farm."

Mr. Durand proposed a vote of thanks to Mr. Dick for his paper.

Mr. Langley seconded the motion, which was carried.

Mr. H. P. Gordon read a paper on "Foundations."

On motion of Mr. Bousfield, seconded by Mr. Gregg, a vote of thanks was tendered to Mr. Gordon.

This concluded the afternoon session and the evening session was spent in discussing the proposed Act of Incorporation.

SECOND DAY.

On business being resumed Thursday morning, the Chairman invited Mr. Alan Macdougall to address the meeting.

Mr. Macdougall said that on behalf of the Canadian Institute he had much pleasure in welcoming the Association. There could be no doubt that this meeting would be a great advantage to the profession of architecture, and that it would also benefit Civil Engineering. It was a singular thing that the Canadian Institute was originally an Association of Architects and Civil Engineers, such as the one now organized and that one of the promoters was the gentleman who presided over this meeting. (Applause.) There was connected with the Institute a Section devoted to Architecture, composed chiefly of younger students. Last year many of the architects were kind enough to recognize the Section, and to read them valuable papers. There could be no doubt that the helping hand thus lent was of valuable assistance. To the Ontario Association of Architects the doors of the Canadian Institute were thrown wide open. He trusted they would avail themselves of the privileges of the Institute, and that they would examine the museum, so that whenever possible they would send contributions to the interesting collection contained therein.

The Chairman, after thanking Mr. Macdougall for his kind expressions, called upon the Secretary to read the reply which had been received to the telegram sent to Cincinnati.

Mr. Townsend read the following reply: "Your telegram received with enthusiasm a few minutes ago, during evening session of the reorganized and enlarged American Institute of Architects, who reciprocate your good wishes and return cordial greetings." (Applause.)

The Secretary read letters from two gentlemen regretting their inability to be present. They were Mr. J. A. Ellis, Meaford, and Mr. F. J. Rastick, Hamilton.

Mr. Bousfield read an instructive paper on "Office Management."

Mr. Gordon moved a vote of thanks to Mr. Bousfield for his very excellent paper, and "that the new Council take into consideration the feasibility of preparing a standard form of certificate."

PROFESSIONAL ETHICS.

Mr. Burke read the following paper on "Professional Ethics."

The 17th Congress of German Physicians held a year ago last June adopted a code of ethics, a summary of which is as follows: "Every kind of public laudation, whether it proceeds from the physician in question himself or from others, and continued advertising in public papers are to be reprobated." *Secondly*, The designation 'specialists,' for puffing purposes is to be reprobated. *Thirdly*, The public offering of medical assistance gratis, underbidding in concluding contracts for sick societies and the like, offering advantages of any kind to a third person in order to procure practice, are inadmissible. *Fourthly*, The ordering and recommending of secret remedies are inadmissible. *Fifthly*, Any attempt of any kind on the part of a physician to intrude upon the practice of another is dishonourable, especially in the case of one who has acted as substitute or in consultation. A practitioner must by no means undertake the treatment of a case without the express consent of the previous physician. A specialist called for a definite part of the treatment must strictly confine himself to that. *Sixthly*, No physician is at liberty to make disparaging remarks to others about another physician.

The spirit of this code is very worthy of emulation by the members of the Ontario Association of Architects.

In dealing with the ethics of our own profession we have to consider them in three relations. 1st, with our client; and, with the contractor; and last but not least, with each other.

The first duty in our relations with our client is a strict and unswerving loyalty to his interests. We are retained to guard his interests and to enable him to obtain a building which will answer his needs and purposes in as complete a manner as the funds which he places at our disposal will permit.

To this end we are morally bound to possess ourselves to the fullest possible degree of his ideas and requirements. To do so will to a very great extent prevent misunderstandings, and avoid disagreeable recriminations and possible litigation.

The second duty in this relation is to ourselves. We must have self-respect. We must not be mere draughtsmen. As long as we are retained in charge of the work we must insist on being its director. We must insist on our right to interpret the meaning of the drawings and specifications, and should not fear to run counter to the desires of the client should he attempt to deal unfairly with the contractor.

Our relations with the contractor require for their happy continuation, firmness and justice.

To exercise firmness requires that we should have mastered the art of building. We should know when we are right and he is wrong, and knowing our position, should in all kindness insist on obedience to our instructions; always acting with discretion.

Justice demands that we should not make the contractor a scape-goat for our own ignorance or delinquencies.

That clause introduced into some specifications, "work not shown on plan but obviously necessary is to be executed without extra charge" is often a cloak for the cowardly or callousness on the part of the architect, and should be expunged from the folios of all self-respecting architects. How is the unfortunate builder who might after night hurriedly dashes through the specifications of various architects in the frantic effort to obtain a job, to pick out and estimate for items which the architect should have inserted had he exercised a very moderate amount of diligence and care?

In a paper prepared by Mr. O. P. Hatfield, architect, of New York, and read before the convention of the National Association of Builders at Philadelphia last February, the following remarks are very much to the point. He says "Although the architect really is, in his superintendence of a building, the agent of the owner, being in his employ and looking to him for compensation for his labors, yet he should not forget that he is also an expert and umpire, who is expected to maintain always a judicial frame of mind and dispense even-handed justice in all his decisions as between the owner and the contractor. He is supposed to be familiar with the best methods of executing the several divisions of work that enter into the construction of a building and with the characteristics of the best qualities of materials as well as with those of the inferior qualities, and therefore capable of giving an unbiased opinion as to their merits, which, in most cases, the owner is not. The latter, therefore, relies upon the judgment, knowledge and experience of his architect to give a fair, honest and just decision upon all questions that may arise as affecting his interest or those of the building during the progress of the work. The architect must be a man of honor; his integrity must be beyond question, his judgment must be good, and his store of acquired knowledge in the line of his profession full and ample. The just mean of favor toward the two parties to the contract will then be observed by him, and the work will be brought to a close to the satisfaction of everyone. The owner will possess a solid substantial building, and the builder, in addition to his cash profits, will have received a wider endorsement of his already good reputation."

Justice requires that we should protect the contractor who has obviously made a serious error in his estimate. It is our duty to advise the client to reject such tender and to advance valid reasons for this advice.

The unseemly display of temper and the use of language unworthy of a self-respecting man is to be very greatly deprecated. Of all men the architect from his position should have his temper well under control and should be choicer in his words, especially when dealing with his workmen. Many occasions arise when most expensating mistakes are made or when willful evasions of the contract occur, but such are no excuse for the forgetfulness of his position and dignity. A few calm and decisive words will carry far more weight than any amount of ranting or swearing.

The acceptance of fees or compensation from the client only is the one item in the code that must be strictly insisted upon. On this "hangs all the law and the prophets" of the honorable practice of the profession.

The architect or rather the apology for one who so far lowers himself as to accept remuneration, direct or indirect, from the contractor or materialman, is fit only to be placed outside the pale of the profession.

The moment he places himself under an obligation to these parties he becomes their servant, his judgment is warped and his independence throttled—he cannot serve two masters, and if he fails of strict allegiance to his client he cannot be just to either.

Should such a transaction come to the knowledge of the client he cannot but lose confidence in the integrity of his architect, and the man who offers the bribe will despise him, treat him with scant courtesy and all the while lose no opportunity of scamping his work.

The bribe-receiving architect is the *pariah* of the profession—we must have no fellowship with him—the skirts of the Association must be kept clean in this respect.

Our relations with each other to be satisfactory and pleasant, require a careful observance of the golden rule "Do unto others as ye would that they should do unto you."

Some of the points in this phrase of the ethics of the profession to be observed in a most punctilious manner are as follows:

1st.—The careful avoidance of taking work from others.

2nd.—No competition in fees.

3rd.—No architect should so forget himself as to make disparaging remarks to another about a brother architect.

4th.—No unprofessional advertising.

In regard to the first point, the avoidance of encroaching on another's preserves, we need to be most careful and conscientious. If for instance a prospective client having had recent dealings with another architect has come to us with the same work, we should, before accepting the commission be sure that the way is clear, and that our predecessor has been honorably settled with. We should also communicate with our predecessor, explain the situation, and guard against doing him an injustice.

As to the second point, *competition in fees*, we need to give out no uncertain sound. If a prospective client asserts that A and B offer to do his work for 3 per cent, we should choke down our lust for more work, quietly give him the regard and usual terms, and then say to him "If your business is not satisfied. A man is usually valued at his own assessment, and the client who insists on having a cheap architect usually gets value for his expenditure. An architect cannot do good work and make a fair living who persists in working for less than the customary fees. If we see such an one taking work year after year and apparently flourishing in business, there is good ground for the suspicion that his percentage is augmented from sources which are not legitimate.

With reference to the third point, how few of us can claim that our skirts are entirely clean. It is very easy to draw a disparaging remark about a brother architect or his work. His faulty specification is a good torch to illumine our immaculate productions, his broken beam will make a good idea upon which we may mount a polemic when they have been suborned as a witness. This is neither generous nor kind. While nothing should prevent his speaking the truth, he should do it in all kindness, excusing, making allowances and even defending, where possible, if he can do so without violence to his conscience.

As to the fourth point, professional advertising, custom sanctions only the profane carelessness of those who with lawyers and doctors. The innovator occasionally flares out on a gaudily painted sign, cheek-by-jowl with