

The Canadian Architect & Builder

A Journal of
Constructive and Decorative Art

PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY
HUGH C. MACLEAN, LIMITED
TORONTO, CANADA.

HEAD OFFICE - Confederation Life Building, TORONTO
Telephone Main 2362

MONTREAL - Telephone Main 2299. B34 Board of Trade
D. BURNSIDE, Representative

WINNIPEG - Telephone 224. 330 Smith St.
ROLAND F. HILL, Representative

VANCOUVER - Telephone 2248. 615 Hastings St.
GEO. A. GALL, Representative

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Canada and Great Britain	- -	\$2.00
United States and Foreign	- -	2.50

Toronto

APRIL, 1908

Montreal

THE withdrawal of the bill introduced in the Ontario Legislature by the Ontario Association of Architects marks another step in the development of architectural affairs, but does not unfortunately seem to bring matters any nearer to a solution. The bill asked for an amendment to the Architect's act whereby the Ontario Association of Architects would be given exclusive right to the use of the word "Architect." It also asked for power to negotiate with the University to do the examining of the Association's students. On both points the bill met with strenuous opposition on the part of a number of architects. They opposed it, first, because they declared that it was asking for ineffectual legislation, inasmuch as the Legislature was only ready to enact laws for the benefit of the public, and for their protection from ineffectual and faulty construction or improper sanitary work and equipment. These two essentials, they claimed, could be obtained by the use of effective building bylaws pertaining to structural and sanitary matters, such as already were in existence in every modern city. Further objection was made, that any standard which the Government might establish, requiring only that a man should be qualified in construction and sanitation, would not make an architect of him, but that such persons should be considered as building inspectors or sanitary and construction engineers. In addition to this they contended that the University only, should have the right to examine, as they only, were prepared to give tuition.

The University objected to the bill also, on the ground that the Government had given to them the charge of higher education in Ontario, and that they did not wish any standard to be set up and controlled by persons who were not giving tuition. They did not wish to enter into any agreement whereby they would be placed in the position of being obliged to examine men who were entitled by law to practice architecture, simply after tak-

ing the examination. What they desired was that persons taking the examination should also take their tuition from the University. They did not wish to become simply an examining body without any supervision over the standard of education to be obtained.

The architects opposing the measure took a somewhat similar stand to the University on this point. They believed that if a standard, such as could be obtained from Legislature, should be enacted, students would obtain their education in a haphazard manner, and on passing the examination, be entitled to have the exclusive use of the word "architect." Having thus obtained permission to practice, many of them would not proceed to take a full University course. As a higher standing of education was a great necessity for the uplifting of the profession they felt themselves obliged to oppose any Legislation which would hinder the University from obtaining students, particularly as the University had already intimated that it was prepared to revise the course in architecture and bring it up to the standard of the courses in the Universities in the United States.

LEGISLATION of a somewhat similar nature to that which has just been withdrawn, is already in force in the States of Illinois, New Jersey and California, where licensing acts have been passed. The objection taken to this, as already stated, is that the Ontario Legislature is prepared to provide a standard only for construction and sanitation, and qualification in these two branches does not make an architect.

The question involves a number of side issues, yet it may be taken for granted that the desire of all architects whether supporters or opponents of the bill, is to have the standard of the profession in Ontario raised. The Legislature has not as yet been able to see its way to pass a licensing act, nor does the University see its way towards making itself an examining body for the association. All architects who have a desire to better the profession should study the question closely. The problems confronting Ontario architects today are as complicated as those of any other country and the time has come when a higher standard is necessary. There does not seem to be much in the way of architects coming together to try and harmonize their differences. The means are at their disposal to turn out men who will be a great credit to the profession. Under the existing arrangements many excellent men have been produced, but a plan should be devised which would lead to the development of a much higher standard of architecture generally. Men are needed today who will devote some of their time to the improvement of the profession, and the only practical means of producing them is by the establishment of a thorough University course. Architects with ambition would seek to avail themselves as quickly as possible of any means of improvement. Today an architect obtains a sound grounding in the essentials of construction and sanitation, and also if he is in a good office, in those of attractive design. Then he takes up the practice of the profession and little further opportunity is given for the development of his tastes, beyond what he may come across in his work. With the incentive of a good University course before him he would in a good many cases find a way to make use of it. The differences of opinion between Ontario architects on this subject are surely not so great that they cannot be overcome or at least lessened. It would be to their own advantage and even more to the advantage of the general public if they could come to some definite agreement before the next session of the Legislature.