

upon the suggestion of the Committee, by declaring the competition "off," and again call for drawings for service pantry, under the same terms and conditions as before. Drawings must reach this office on or before 1st February. Full particulars are printed elsewhere under the heading "CANADIAN ARCHITECT AND BUILDER Series of Prize Competitions. Competitors will please note carefully the manner in which drawings should be prepared.—EDITOR C. A. & B.]

COMPETITION FOR PLASTER CORNICE AND CENTRE PIECE.

The designs submitted in the CANADIAN ARCHITECT AND BUILDER competition for Plaster Cornice and Centres, we beg to report as standing in the following order of merit:

No. 1, by "Circus," we place first. Although not drawn with the clever sweep of No. 2, there is, however, evidence that author has given most study to contrasted effect of different mouldings and ornament, and the two small centres are quite new treatment of familiar ornament.

No. 2, by "Me," are well designed, well drawn outlines of good style of cornices and turned centres, which of all submitted are perhaps most in accord with present work.

No. 3, by "Put I Kote," are very good examples of a style which imitates wood construction somewhat. The smaller one of both cornices and centres we judge to be the better. The 25" centre, although perhaps more original, requires refinement in parts, and the wall members of 30" cornice are decidedly heavy.

No. 4, by "Casino," Of the cornices on the sheet, the 25 inch girth is the best, and would make an effective cornice, although mouldings of all the cornices are a trifle small and too numerous, and freehand drawing wants cultivation.

No. 5, by "No. 3." The plain and moulded surfaces of cornices are fairly disposed. Of the centres, the plaster one is the best. But these drawings suffer much from drawing of ornament, which is too natural and rudimentary.

No. 6, by "Ogee," is hardly up to class of preceding, and will doubtless improve with more experience.

Your obedient servants,

R. J. EDWARDS.
JOHN GEMMELL.
W. A. LANGTON.

The names of the competitors in this interesting competition, are in their order of merit, as follows:

- No. 1, by "Circus," Thomas R. Johnson, 74 Baldwin St. Toronto.
- No. 2, "Me," H. Action Bond, Toronto.
- No. 3, "Put-I-Kote," William England, 159 Markland St. Hamilton.
- No. 4, "Casino," Geo. J. Schell, 116 Church St., Toronto.
- No. 5, "No. 3," James Walker, 5 Ann St., Toronto.
- No. 6, "Ogee," S. E. Wells, 43 Yorkville Ave., Toronto.

THE CONFEDERATION LIFE ASSOCIATION BUILDING COMPETITION.

Editor CANADIAN ARCHITECT AND BUILDER.

DEAR SIR,—I have just returned from an inspection of the competitive designs for the Confederation Life Association building, now on view at the Canadian Institute, and the (to me) apparent injustice of the selection of "Lux" prompts me to suggest that the Board of Directors of the Association should be asked to consider how far they have fulfilled their promises to the competitors, as set forth in the "Instructions to Architects."

To the fact that the names of the gentlemen forming this Board are above the suspicion of unfairness, the success of the Board in obtaining designs from nearly all the leading men in the province is undoubtedly due; and I cannot think that these gentlemen will allow the stigma of such a decision to rest upon their shoulders, when the facts of the case are made clear to them.

In the conditions of the competition the Board promises the competitor that it will, with the aid of an unbiased professional adviser, select the best four designs for the respective prizes; and yet this "unbiased" professional adviser candidly admits that he has not "entertained" several designs submitted (and among them those which, in the opinion of most of the architects attending the convention, were most deserving) because, forsooth, he chose to take the third paragraph of the "conditions" as meaning something altogether different from what it appears to an ordinary English reader to mean.

This paragraph reads "The following drawings will" (mark, "will," not "must") be furnished by each competitor, and these only will be received and considered, but minor variations of detail or alternative arrangements may be shown on any of the drawings by means of flaps: Plans of the different storeys and the basement; Elevations; Perspective."

Now three of the best designs submitted, "Interest," "A Good Investment" and "1890," are disqualified by the expert under this clause. "Interest" does not submit all the drawings named above, but he does submit a sufficient number of them to make his intentions perfectly clear to any properly qualified expert who chose to take the trouble to study the drawings sent, while "1890" only appears to be guilty of the crime of neglecting to show a Yonge st. elevation and to attach he drawings intended as alternative arrangements to the sheets they are intended to be alternative to. The treatment accorded "A Good Investment" is even more outrageous. The author submits plans of the different storeys and basement, all three elevations, two sections through main office and one section through front half of building for heights, etc., and a perspective, together with additional sheets or flaps, showing an alternative treatment of the elevations and of the main and office floors. It is true that some portions of the perspective were not inked in, and that sheets showing alternative arrangements of plans or elevations were not attached to the main drawings, but the former is nevertheless clearly a perspective within the meaning

of paragraph 6, which reads:—"The perspective will be drawn in line only without shading and without any accessories, such as sky, trees, figures, etc." and the latter are practically unattached flaps, i. e., any one of them, if laid over the drawing or part it is intended as an alternative to, would properly fill the place. The "unbiased" professional expert, however, disqualifies this design because it is not sent in as required by the "Instructions," and selects a design which, among other faults, is able to boast of an arrangement which separates the type-writers, Secretary, supply room, storage, vault, lunch room, lavatory, etc., from other parts of the main office by the public space, and the Secretary from the Managing Director by a narrow passage 25 or 30 feet long; so that if the Managing Director wants a typewriter, the young lady must tramp 25 or 30 feet along the public passage among the customers, agents, etc., then pass through the Secretary's room and along another 25 feet passage to his room; or if a clerk in the main office wants to wash his hands or to get a sheet of paper from the supply room, he must go outside the office and 70 or 80 feet along the public corridor among the customers to accomplish his purpose. Then the main vault is 8 x 21 with a door in the side, although the instructions distinctly call for a vault 10 x 18 with a door in the end.

Now, if Mr. Hopkins had taken the trouble to qualify himself to some extent for the position of an expert in this competition by enquiring into the way in which the work in such an office is carried on, he would have found that these peculiarities of arrangement are serious defects. If he did not know this, he should not have accepted the position of expert, and if he did know it, he should not have given the decision he did. The competitors have at least the right to expect consistency, and when an expert presumes to disqualify certain designs on account of alleged non-compliance with the conditions, he should be sure that the designs he selects for recommendation comply with those conditions.

The expert's criticism upon the elevational treatment would be laughable were it not for the serious interests involved. The fortunate "Lux" is described as a "building of a very pleasing and distinctive character, showing at a glance the purposes for which it is intended, namely a public institution and at the same time a commercial building," whatever that may mean, while "Paid up Policy," one of the most carefully studied elevations submitted, is passed over with the clause, "plain in character," the "plain" being evidently intended to be understood to mean "common place," and "Interest," another splendid elevation, is not even deemed worthy of mention.

That "a public institution" and at the same time a "commercial building" should have the central tower, the main feature of the principal elevation, emphasizing the entrance to a dry goods lane (as is the case in "Lux") may seem to Mr. Hopkins appropriate, as indicating the dual "purposes" of the building, but to my mind it savors of bad design.

Faithfully yours,

ONE OF THE REJECTED ONES.

Toronto, Dec. 1st, 1889.

CONTRACTS OPEN.

TRENTON, ONT.—Messrs. Potter & Ayers will erect buildings for manufacturing purposes.

ORILLIA, ONT.—By vote of the citizens a lot has been selected as the site for a new post office.

WHITBY, ONT.—A joint system of water supply for this town and, the town of Oshawa, is talked of.

KINGSTON, ONT.—The Governors of the Kingston general hospital have decided to build a new wing to cost \$20,000.

NIAGARA, ONT.—Voting on the by-law to raise \$30,000 for water works here resulted in 83 yeas for the by-law and 29 against.

WEST TORONTO JUNCTION.—The Disciples have recently purchased a plot of land on Keele street with a view to the erection of a church.

WOODSTOCK, ONT.—A committee of the county council of Oxford has reported in favor of the erection of a poor house. Action on the report has been deferred until January.

MONTREAL, QUE.—A syndicate is negotiating for the purchase of the Montreal Warehouse Co.'s large warehouses on Wellington St. It is intended, so soon as the property changes hands, to considerably enlarge and improve the buildings.—It is proposed to erect a gallery in St. Paul's church.

TORONTO, ONT.—The Board of Works will shortly advertise for tenders for laying a lot of cedar roadways, with the intention that the work shall not be started until early spring, but that the material shall be got ready during the winter.—The following building permits have been issued from the office of the City Commissioner since 1st December: Geo. Elridge, pr. a storey det. bk. dwellings, 580 Manning Ave., cost \$2,000; T. B. La Belle, pr. s. d. 2 storey and attic bk. dwellings, Euclid Ave. north of Ulster St., cost \$5,000; J. Capell, a storey and attic bk. dwellings, 352 Ontario, cost \$2,000; J. A. Simmers, bk. add. to 149 King St. east, cost \$7,600; J. Gordon Jones, bk. warehouse, rear 70 King St. west, cost \$6,000; B. Langley, a storey and attic bk. dwelling, Bernard Ave., cost \$4,000; Jno. Shanessy, three 3 storey bk. stores, McCaul St., opposite Caer Howell, cost \$5,000; T. E. Stephenson, alterations to two houses, Maitland Pl., cost \$5,000; S. Tulloch, pr. s. d. a storey and attic bk. dwellings, Cowan Ave., cost \$3,600; L. C. Sheppard, three pr. att. 3 storey bk. dwellings, Park Road, cost \$9,000; Jas. Tulloch, a storey bk. dwelling, 160 Cowan Ave., cost \$2,800; L. C. Sheppard, seven a storey att. bk. dwellings, Reynold St., cost \$5,600; T. J. Dudley, two pr. a storey and attic bk. fronted dwellings, 190 to 205 Seaton St., cost \$3,600; Fred. Phillips, pr. a storey and attic bk. dwellings, Maitland St., near Yonge, cost \$6,000.