acter. Such is not the case. The question has been more or less before the profession for the last twenty-five years, since the Royal Institute of British Architects made a movement toward that end a quarter of a century ago. During the last three or four years the movement in Great Britain has assumed a definite form, and a Bill was submitted to the House of Commons in 1888, which, however, was withdrawn at that time, owing to the opposition of the Royal Institute of British Architects and the Civil Engineers, but submitted again in 1889 in a revised form. There is no doubt but that it will eventually pass. In some of the Australian colonies the matter has been taken in hand, and a Bill to incorporate the architects of these colonies is now under discussion. In the United States, Bills have already been submitted to some of the State Legislatures, and advanced several stages; and in many of the other States Bills are under preparation for submission to the Legislature. It will thus be seen that this movement is not a new or sudden one. It is rather an old one which has slowly gathered force until Acts of Incorporation are now being asked for in all quarters of the world for the proper and equitable acknowledgement of the profession of architecture, in order that the public may be protected from loss of life and money through the ignorance of many supposed qualified practitioners. The membership of the Ontario Association of Architects includes 92 per cent. of all men now practicing architecture in this province, and when those who have applied for admittance to the Association are received, the percentage will be 97. The movement has received the full and hearty support of the medical profession in Great Britain. Medical men are brought into contact with the ill effects of bad building, drainage, etc., and knowing the results, are only too anxious to aid in securing such legislation as will remedy an evil which has caused many deaths, much sickness, and heavy pecuniary losses.

## THE ABILITY OF ARCHITECTS TO ESTIMATE.

Editor CANADIAN ARCHITECT AND BUILDER.

IN the last issue of your journal I notice an editorial comment on my letter published in your November edition on the above subject. Apology is made for the publication of the letter, and the reasons assigned are "that all duly qualified architects are capable of approximately estimating the cost of the erection of their designs; that the custom in England as stated is misleading," etc.

In reply I respectfully submit, that every properly qualified architect should be thoroughly competent to estimate the cost of the erection of his designs, and if he is not, he should have it done for him. But just here is where the trouble exists, for it is well known in the profession, both in Canada and elsewhere, that very few, if any, of the very best architects can prepare a systematic bill of quantities. They never learned how to do it, and always consider it unnecessary that they should learn. It is a duty requiring time, skill and practice of quite a different character from designing and preparing plans, and if they are qualified to give a fair estimate of the cost of proposed buildings and feel it their duty to do so, their results prove either inability or neglect of duty.

I am well posted in the routine of architects' offices in Great Britain and Canada, and take exception to the statement that the custom in England as laid down by me is misleading, for the custom I presume is the same in Great Britain now as it was fifteen years ago, at which time it was the general rule or practice for the architect having prepared his plans and specifications, to either retain the services of a professional quantity surveyor, and supply bill of quantities to parties tendering for the work (to be paid for by the successful competitor), or the contractors united in appointing the surveyor, paying him themselves as by agreement made. Some contractors having a preference for a certain surveyor, would possibly engage his services to check the quantities, as at liberty to do but unless the job was a small one, the surveyor was always retained. I never knew that the client was consulted or concerned at all about the quantities, or paying for them. He placed his building in the architect's hands on whom he had reliance as to ability and integrity, and the architect knowing his duty to all parties concerned, supplied quantities to the contractors, the successful one having to pay for them whether he used them or not. On Government work, however, the Board of Ordnance always supplies printed bills of quantities (without charge) to the contractor to estimate on, at so much above, below, or at par on the schedule prices, and which also rules for extra work and advances made on the contract.

As regards the architect or his client's responsibility for the correctness of the quantities, it was always specially agreed upon that the contractor himself was solely responsible.

I have pleasure in replying to Mr. A. T. Timewell's able letter in your last issue on the subject, and coincide with all he has set forth, with the exception of the statement that some architects for their own protection make a practice of taking out the quantities. I don't think they do anything of the kind, for if they are qualified to do so, barring the reputation for giving close preliminary estimates, it entails a deal of time and trouble without any direct recompense. At least they are not obliged to do it, therefore they don't, and all the duly qualified architects know it. The rule of practice should be that a competent party should be engaged to take out the quantities for which he would be paid by the contractor to whom the contract was awarded.

The columns of your journal are certainly the proper medium to discuss this important subject, and the profession should not be too conservative on matters calling for immediate reform.

Yours, &c.,

T SQUARE.

[Our correspondent in his letter of November wrote in the present tense, and now he states that it was of fifteen years ago that he was writing. We hardly know why he should "presume that the custom is the same now as it was fifteen years ago." The custom in regard to quantity surveying is not the same now as it was eight years ago, to say nothing of fifteen. We do know cases in which about eight years ago the architect took out his quantities, had them printed or lithographed, and the successful tenderer paid the printer's bill on the receipt of his first certificate on account of the work he had executed. But the custom now in the best offices is to employ the services of a member of a new profession, namely, a "quantity surveyor," for although quantity surveyors had existed for years previously as a convenience for architects and builders, yet until about seven years ago the necessity for the regular employment of properly qualified surveyors of quantities was not recognized. Quantity surveying is now a separate profession. The employers are usually the architects, not the builders, and the architect includes in his charges, "preparation of quantities," and pays the surveyor's account, his client having already paid him for them.—ED. C. A. & B.]

## OUR ILLUSTRATIONS.

COMPETITIVE DESIGN FOR CATHEDRAL OF ST. JOHN THE DIVINE, NEW YORK.—JAMES R. RHIND, ARCHITECT, MONTREAL, QUE.

THE dome is 555 feet from the floor of the church to the base of the cross, and 595 feet from the level of 110th street in front of the building. It would take St. Peter's at Rome inside, as St. Peter's will take St. Paul's, London, and it would be the largest and loftiest dome in the world. The dimensions of the dome are 200 feet inside and 240 feet outside. The height of the front towers from 110th street is 360 feet. The dome is to be on a line with 112th street. The length of the building inside is 400 feet, according to conditions of competition. The height of the nave to the top of the domed ceiling inside is 180 feet. The length of the building outside the portico is 512 feet.

INTERIOR OF ST. MARY'S CATHEDRAL, HAMILTON, ONT.—THOS. CONNOLLY, A. R. C. A., ARCHITECT, TORONTO.

RESIDENCE FOR THOS. MARKS, PORT ARTHUR, ONT.—EDWARDS & WEBSTER, ARCHITECTS, TORONTO.

The students, graduates and faculty of the Toronto School of Practical Science, spent a most pleasant evening together recently on the occasion of their first annual dinner.