

we do not mean that a greater depth or wider footings are required than are proportionate to the weight of walls, but that other methods of procedure are necessary. A building now being erected on the corner of Broadway and Ann streets, New York, is to be twenty-six storeys above the sidewalk. A skeleton steel frame, built in with a wall four feet thick for several storeys, then three feet, then two feet, until the top is reached. These heavy walls call for a special foundation, so constructed as to meet every possible condition of settlement. This is accomplished by building under the main columns a double shoe with its two parts just alike. These shoes rest on iron rails ten or twelve feet long, bedded in concrete. There are two or three layers of these rails, according to the character of the soil, and they are laid, first, side by side, until an exact square is formed, then the next layer is placed at right angles to the first, the whole being filled in with properly tempered concrete. The space between the two legs of this double shoe is utilized for holding a powerful hydraulic jack, which is placed directly under the centre of the pier and rests in the middle of the concrete and iron foundation. The object of having the jacks placed in these openings is to be prepared to raise the building to its proper level if any displacement should ensue during construction. While the manner of using a double shoe under piers is novel, the scheme of building in hydraulic lifts is not, for if we remember rightly, a number of jacks were built in the foundations of the Marquette Building, Chicago, Ill., for the same purpose.

SOME OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

THE Canadian Manufacturer has recently devoted considerable space to a criticism of the action of the Ontario Association of Architects in seeking legislation to restrict the use of the title "Architect" to properly qualified persons. It admits the necessity of providing some means whereby incompetent persons would be prevented from planning and supervising the construction of important buildings. It, however, finds fault with the architects for proposing, in the event of legislation being obtained, to admit into the ranks of the profession all persons who have hitherto been engaged in the practice of architecture and known by the title of architect.

In effect, the Manufacturer says to the architects, "You place emphasis on the fact that it is important that the design and construction of buildings should only be entrusted to qualified men, and that you are desirous of raising the standard of architectural practice, but at the same time you propose to allow every man now practicing as an architect, no matter how incompetent he may be, to continue to call himself an architect and to design and erect buildings as he has been accustomed to do heretofore."

Will the Manufacturer give us a better method of raising the standard of architectural practice than the one proposed by the promoters of this Bill? The architects are simply doing the best they can under the circumstances. If they were to ask for the exclusion from the profession of every person now practicing as an architect who should not be able to pass a certain qualifying examination, we are quite safe in saying that the Legislature would not consider for a moment their application. It would at once see the injustice which would result to men who have spent years in the practice of architecture, if they were compelled, perhaps beyond the

period of middle life, to abandon their calling or at least to pursue it under a different name. Seeing that it would not be possible to obtain legislation by which the standard of the profession might immediately be raised to the desired level, the architects have wisely adopted the more moderate course of asking for legislation by means of which the standard could gradually be raised. If the desired legislation were obtained, the number of incompetent architects would for a time remain as at present, but the door would be closed to additions to their ranks, and the coming generation of architects would be compelled to undergo a proper course of study and pass the necessary examinations to qualify them for the proper discharge of their duties.

The situation may briefly be stated thus: If the standard of architectural practice is ever to be raised, a start must be made in that direction, and if means cannot be found to immediately raise the standard to the required level, the architects are surely not deserving of censure for adopting a course whereby that object may be gradually attained.

ONTARIO ARCHITECTS' ACT.

WE regret to state that the Ontario Architects' Bill in the Ontario Legislature has again been withdrawn. The majority of the members of the Committee expressed themselves as having no personal objection to the measure, and the Bill was reported by the Committee to the House. The mover of the Bill deemed it wise, however, to withdraw it for the present, believing that the feeling of the House was not sufficiently favorable to insure the passage of the measure, and that the longer it is kept before the House the better its objects will be understood and the more probable will be its final adoption.

One of the strongest opponents of the Bill was the speaker of the House, who announced himself as being opposed on general principles to all such legislation, while unable to give any specific and satisfactory reasons for his opposition. He even went so far as to lobby against the Bill, a most unusual and undignified proceeding.

The great obstacle in the way of the measure appeared to be the inability of the legislators to understand the object which the architects had in view in seeking to obtain this legislation. They seemed to take it for granted that there must be on the part of the architects a personal object to be gained, and because they could not discover such an object they regarded the Bill with suspicion. In view of the suspicion in which the efforts of the architects are held and their methods questioned, it were much better that the legislation sought should be promoted by persons entirely outside of the profession. There are a large number of persons who thoroughly understand the necessity for such legislation as will elevate the standard of architectural practice in this province, and we believe it would be possible to obtain an influentially signed petition asking the Government to legislate on the question. The Government appears to be thoroughly in accord with the objects of the Bill, and we would be pleased if they could see their way to introduce a Government measure dealing with the question.

A great many architects and builders now ride wheels, as they are found to be cheaper and more convenient than the regulation horse and buggy. The Vokes Hardware Co., Toronto, announce that they are sole Canadian agents for the Ben-Hur wheel, which has won for itself an excellent record. A catalogue giving full particulars may be had on request to the company.