

THE  
OCTAGON

---

*A Journal of The American Institute of Architects*

---



*APRIL*  
1933

*Volume 5*

*Number 4*

# THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

THE OCTAGON, WASHINGTON, D. C.

## OFFICERS

*President*..... ERNEST JOHN RUSSELL, Chemical Building, St. Louis, Mo.  
*First Vice-President*..... CHARLES D. MAGINNIS, Statler Bldg., Boston, Mass.  
*Second Vice-President*..... HORACE W. PEASLEE, 1228 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.  
*Secretary*..... FRANK C. BALDWIN, The Octagon, Washington, D. C.  
*Treasurer*..... EDWIN BERGSTROM, Citizens National Bank Bldg., Los Angeles, Cal.

## BOARD OF DIRECTORS

**For One Year (1932-33)**  
 FRANKLIN O. ADAMS... 509 Twigg Street, Tampa, Fla. (South Atlantic Div.)  
 M. H. FURBRINGER... 110 Porter Bldg., Memphis, Tenn. (Gulf States Div.)  
 FREDERICK H. MEYER 525 Market St., San Francisco, Calif. (Sierra Nevada Div.)

**For Two Years (1932-34)**  
 ALBERT L. BROCKWAY... Clinton Sq. Bldg., Syracuse, N. Y. (New York Div.)  
 GEORGE H. GRAY, 30 Whitney Avenue, New Haven, Conn. (New England Div.)  
 FREDERICK M. MANN, Univ. of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn. (Cen. Sta. Div.)

**For Three Years (1932-35)**  
 HERBERT E. HEWITT, 1600 Peoria Life Bldg., Peoria, Ill. (Great Lakes Div.)  
 JAMES O. BEVELLE, Chamber of Commerce Bldg., Newark, N. J. (Middle Atl. Div.)  
 RAYMOND J. ANTHONY, 312 Vermont Bldg., Salt Lake City, Utah (West Mount. Div.)

## LIST OF CHAPTERS 1933

ALABAMA—\*Frederic Child Biggin, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, Ala.; †Hugh Martin, 910 Title Guarante Bldg., Birmingham, Ala.  
 ALBANY—\*Frank A. Ward, Telephone Bldg., Albany, N. Y.; †Clarence H. Gardiner, 585 Delmar, N. Y.  
 ARKANSAS—\*George H. Wittenberg, Home Insurance Bldg., Little Rock, Ark.; †Lawson L. Delony, 2407 Louisiana St., Little Rock, Ark.  
 BALTIMORE—\*William G. Nolting, Keyser Building, Baltimore, Md.; †Charles D. Loomis, 12 East Pleasant Street, Baltimore, Md.  
 BOSTON—\*Ralph W. Gray, 73 Newbury St., Boston, Mass.; †Isidor Richmond, 248 Boylston St., Boston, Mass.  
 BROOKLYN—\*William A. Sanders, 527 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.; †George Francis Kiess, 4 Irving Place, New York, N. Y.  
 BUFFALO—\*Harry F. Hudson, Dun Building, Buffalo, N. Y.; †Benning C. Buell, 547 Franklin St., Buffalo, N. Y.  
 CENTRAL ILLINOIS—\*L. H. Provine, 505 Michigan Ave., Urbana, Ill.; †E. L. Stouffer, 256 Administration Bldg., University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.  
 CENTRAL NEW YORK—\*Walter H. Cassebeer, 84 Exchange St., Rochester, N. Y.; †Leonard A. Waasdrop, 311 Alexander St., Rochester, N. Y.  
 CHICAGO—\*Clarence W. Farrier, Administration Bldg., Burnham Park, Chicago, Ill.; †Carl E. Heimbrod, 20 No. Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.  
 CINCINNATI—\*John H. Deeken, 15 East 8th St., Cincinnati, O.; †Alan K. Laing, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O.  
 CLEVELAND—\*Abram Garfield, National City Bldg., Cleveland, Ohio; †G. Evans Mitchell, Bulkley Bldg., Cleveland, Ohio.  
 COLORADO—\*George H. Williamson, Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.; †Roland L. Linder, Insurance Building, Denver, Colo.  
 COLUMBUS—\*Charles L. Inesco, 1200 Brunson Bldg., Columbus, Ohio; †Ralph Chas. Kempton, Atlas Building, 8 E. Long St., Columbus, Ohio.  
 CONNECTICUT—\*Harold H. Davis, 29 Whitney Ave., New Haven, Conn.; †Lorenzo Hamilton, 22 Church St., Meriden, Conn.  
 DAYTON—\*Freeman A. Pretsinger, 1155 Reinhold Bldg., Dayton, Ohio; †Geo. T. Neuffer, 437 Ludlow Arcade, Dayton, Ohio.  
 DELAWARE—\*G. Morris Whiteide, II, 2160 duPont Bldg., Wilmington, Del.; †Roscoe Cook Tinsall, 914 Orange Street, Wilmington, Del.  
 DETROIT—\*Branson V. Gamber, 3500 Union Guardian Bldg., Detroit, Mich.; †Arthur K. Hyde, 318 Woodward Blvd. Bldg., Detroit, Mich.  
 EASTERN OHIO—\*Walter J. Canfield, 33 North Hazel St., Youngstown, O.; †Clarence A. Kisinger, 2540 Market St., Youngstown, O.  
 FLORIDA CENTRAL—\*Francis J. Kennard, Krause Bldg., Tampa Fla.; †Frank A. Winn, Jr., Stovall Office Bldg., Tampa, Fla.  
 FLORIDA NORTH—\*Bernard W. Close, 1005 Bisbee Bldg., Jacksonville, Fla.; †Jefferson D. Powell, Professional Building, Jacksonville, Fla.  
 FLORIDA SOUTH—\*Russell T. Panoceast, 1139 Lincoln Road, Miami Beach Fla.; †Robert L. Weed, 2820 Biscayne Blvd. Miami, Fla.  
 GEORGIA—\*Harold Bush-Brown, 67 Peachtree Pl. N. W., Atlanta, Ga.; †M. A. Tucker, Rhodes-Haverty Bldg., Atlanta, Ga.  
 GRAND RAPIDS—\*Harry L. Mead, 902 Michigan Trust Bldg., Grand Rapids, Mich.; †Roger Allen, 610 Lafayette Ave., S. E., Grand Rapids, Mich.  
 HAWAII—\*Hart Wood, 517 Hawaiian Trust Bldg., Honolulu, T. H.; †Herbert Cayton, 324 S. M. Damon Bldg., Honolulu, T. H.  
 INDIANA—\*Warren D. Miller, 819 Ohio Street, Terre Haute, Ind.; †Geo. C. Wright, Architects & Bldrs. Bldg., Indianapolis, Ind.  
 IOWA—\*James A. Doucher, 310 Old Colony Bldg., Des Moines, Iowa; †Edwin H. Wetherell, 506 Shops Bldg., Des Moines, Iowa.  
 KANSAS CITY—\*Arthur S. Keene, 1005 Land Bank Bldg., Kansas City, Mo.; †Roy E. Crane, 1412 Knox, Northern Kansas City, Mo.  
 KANSAS—\*Chester M. Routledge, 204 Exchange National Bank Bldg., Hutchinson, Kansas; †George M. Beal, 305 Marvin Hall, Lawrence, Kansas.  
 KENTUCKY—\*G. M. Grimes, 1708 Heyburn Building, Louisville, Ky.; †Carl J. Epping, 806 East Broadway, Louisville, Ky.  
 LOUISIANA—\*Walter Cook Keenan, 4239 St. Charles Ave., New Orleans, La.; †Andrew M. Lockett, Jr., Balter Bldg., New Orleans, La.  
 MADISON—\*Frank Riley, 24 E. Mifflin Street, Madison, Wisc.; †James R. Law, First Central Building, Madison, Wisc.  
 MINNESOTA—\*A. B. Dunham, 512 Essex Bldg., Minneapolis, Minn.; †Albert O. Larson, 308 Baker Bldg., Minneapolis, Minn.  
 MISSISSIPPI—\*N. W. Overstreet, Standard Life Bldg., Jackson, Miss.; †A. Hays Town, 1219-25 Standard Life Bldg., Jackson, Miss.  
 MONTANA—\*Chandler C. Cohagen, Box 1305, Billings, Mont.; †W. R. Flew, Roseman, Mont.  
 NEBRASKA—\*James M. Nachtigall, 512 Paxton Bldg., Omaha, Neb.; †N. R. Brigham, 607 Keeline Bldg., Omaha, Neb.  
 NEW JERSEY—\*Seymour Williams, Woodruff Bldg., Rahway, N. J.; †Clement W. Fairweather, Metuchen, N. J.  
 NEW YORK—\*Charles H. Higgins, 101 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.; †Eric Kebbon, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.  
 NORTH CAROLINA—\*Harry Barton, Jefferson Standard Bldg., Greensboro N. C.; †Walter W. Hook, Commercial Bank Bldg., Charlotte, N. C.  
 NORTH TEXAS—\*Frank O. Witzell, First National Bank Building, Dallas, Texas; †M. C. Kleuser, 609 Construction Bldg., Dallas, Texas.  
 NORTHERN CALIFORNIA—\*John J. Donovan, 950 Parker Street, Berkeley, Calif.; †James H. Mitchell, 369 Pine St., San Francisco, Calif.  
 NORTHWESTERN PENNSYLVANIA—\*Walter Monahan, Palace Hardware Building, Erie, Pa.; †J. Howard Hicks, Palace Hardware Building, Erie, Pa.  
 OKLAHOMA—\*Leon B. Senter, 306 Philtower Bldg., Tulsa, Okla.; †Asbury Endacott, 625 Wright Building, Tulsa, Okla.  
 OREGON—\*Harold W. Doty, 697 East 46th Street, Portland, Oregon; †W. H. Crowell, 1041 Pacific Building, Portland, Oregon.  
 PHILADELPHIA—\*Ralph B. Bencker, 1601 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.; †Edmund R. Purves, Architects' Bldg., Philadelphia, Pa.  
 PITTSBURGH—\*Press C. Dowler, Century Bldg., Pittsburgh, Pa.; †Charles Stots, Bessemer Bldg., Pittsburgh, Pa.  
 RHODE ISLAND—\*Albert Harkness, 1428 Industrial Trust Bldg., Providence, R. I.; †Norman Isham, Wickford, R. I.  
 SAN DIEGO—\*Louis J. Gill, Suite 32, Sefton Bldg., San Diego, Calif.; †Charles H. Mills, 1400 San Diego Trust & Savings Bldg., San Diego, Calif.  
 SANTA BARBARA—\*Harold E. Burket, 455 E. Main St., Ventura, Calif.; †Henry W. Howell, 157 Cheltenham Drive, Santa Barbara, Calif.  
 SCRANTON-WILKES-BARRE—\*Geo. M. D. Lewis, 909 Scranton Electric Bldg., Scranton, Pa.; †Searle Von Storch, Union National Bank Bldg., Scranton, Pa.  
 SHREVEPORT—\*Samuel G. Wiener, Shreveport, La.; †Edward F. Neild, Shreveport, La.  
 SOUTH CAROLINA—\*Albert Simons, 42 Broad St., Charleston, S. C.; †Samuel Lapham, 42 Broad St., Charleston, S. C.  
 SOUTH GEORGIA—\*Cletus Bergen, 1013 Liberty Bldg., Savannah, Ga.; †Percy Sugden, 125 East 49th St., Savannah, Ga.  
 SOUTH TEXAS—\*Maurice J. Sullivan, 4301 Main St., Houston, Texas; †J. Russ Baty, 506 Bankers Mortgage Bldg., Houston, Texas.  
 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA—\*Gordon B. Kaufmann, 610 Union Bank Bldg., Los Angeles, Cal.; †Palmer Sabin, 170 East Calif. St., Pasadena, Cal.  
 SOUTHERN PENNSYLVANIA—\*M. E. Green, Third and Forster Sts., Harrisburg, Pa.; †John G. Todd, 253 Cumberland St., Harrisburg, Pa.  
 ST. LOUIS—\*W. Oscar Mulgardt, 1620 Chemical Bldg., St. Louis, Mo.; †Fred R. Hammond, 7020 Waterman Ave., St. Louis, Mo.  
 ST. PAUL—\*Edwin H. Lundie, 324 Endicott Bldg., St. Paul, Minn.; †G. A. Anderson, 1212 Builders Exchange Bldg., St. Paul, Minn.  
 TENNESSEE—\*J. Fraser Smith, 400 Goodwya Institute, Memphis, Tenn.; †R. J. Regan, 736 Bank of Commerce Bldg., Memphis, Tenn.  
 TOLEDO—\*Charles A. Langdon, Security Bank Bldg., Toledo, Ohio; †Karl B. Hoke, 1118 Madison Avenue, Toledo, Ohio.  
 UTAH—\*Lorenzo Young, 1458 Princeton Ave., Salt Lake City, Utah; †Claude Ashworth, 8-9 Farrer Bldg., Provo, Utah.  
 VIRGINIA—\*Philip N. Stern, 21 Law Building, Fredericksburg, Va.; †Fendleton S. Clark, 610 Kruse Bldg., Lynchburg, Va.  
 WASHINGTON, D. C.—\*Francis P. Sullivan, 726 Jackson Pl., N. W., Washington, D. C.; †Donald S. Johnson, Colorado Bldg., Washington, D. C.  
 WASHINGTON STATE—\*J. Lister Holmes, 504 Republic Building, Seattle, Wash.; †Lance E. Gowen, 307 Medical Arts Bldg., Seattle, Wash.  
 WEST TEXAS—\*Raymond Phelps, Gunter Bldg., San Antonio, Texas; †Richard Vander Straten, Travis Bldg., San Antonio, Texas.  
 WEST VIRGINIA—\*C. C. Wood, Lowndes Bldg., Clarkburg, W. Va.; †C. E. Silling, 14 Hubbard Court, Charleston, W. Va.  
 WISCONSIN—\*Roger C. Kirchhoff, 710 N. Plankinton Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.; †Alexander C. Guth, 1249 N. Franklin Place, Milwaukee, Wis.

\*Presidents.

†Secretaries.

# THE OCTAGON

A Journal of The American Institute of Architects

Published Monthly by

The American Institute of Architects

Executive and Publication Offices, The Octagon, 1741 New York Avenue N. W., Washington, D. C.

TWENTY-FIVE CENTS THE COPY. \$1 PER YEAR. (FOREIGN \$2)

Checks or Money Orders should be made payable to The American Institute of Architects  
All communications for publication should be sent to The Secretary, The A. I. A.

Copyright, 1929, by The American Institute of Architects

Entered as second-class matter, February 9, 1929, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C.

## The Affairs of the Institute

By ERNEST JOHN RUSSELL, *President*

THE Board of Directors met Wednesday morning, March fifteenth, and by adhering closely to the business in hand was able to dispose of the one hundred and two cases comprising the Agenda by Saturday night. Among these were the approval of the acts of the Executive Committee; and the reports from Regional Directors, Standing and Special Committees, and the Treasurer.

The Regional Directors' reports gave birdseye views of the conditions throughout the entire country. They were decidedly interesting, and they were illuminating to the Directors who heard them. It is unfortunate that they cannot be published in full, as they tell graphically the story of the architectural profession and of the efforts of our members to make the best of a bad situation. They give evidence of courage, and of activities that are of immediate help to less fortunate members of the profession, and of keen interest in civic affairs. It is a genuine pleasure to participate in the discussions of the Board and to realize that each member has the interests of the Institute at heart. They are an exceedingly hard working crowd and back each other up splendidly.

Mr. Baldwin, the Secretary, is recuperating from a severe illness, but made his appearance each day. Mr. Hewitt, of the Central States Division, was unable to be on hand because of an eye affliction.

The Board decided that it would not meet again until immediately prior to the convention of 1934. In the meantime, the Executive Committee is empowered to act on all matters coming before it.

The Treasurer's Report was in the nature of a bomb shell as it revealed that delinquent dues for years prior to 1933 now amount to more than \$40,000, and there is such a great reduction in income from dues for the current year as to necessitate drastic action so far as 1933 budget appropriations

are concerned. The Treasurer will tell the story in his own words, which will appear simultaneously with this report. It was found necessary to abolish the appropriations for the Chapter visits of Officers and Directors; to reduce committee appropriations to the minimum; to reduce again the staff at THE OCTAGON; and to make further reductions in all staff salaries, which had been cut a year ago. It was with deep regret that these additional cuts had to be made. Each member of the staff exhibits the keenest loyalty to the Institute, ignores long office hours and carries on the activities to the best of his or her ability.

It may be interesting to the members to learn that there are many more demands upon the staff in these days than there are in normal times although the number is reduced from twelve to seven—including the Publicist. The reduction in number of employees necessarily limits the output of work, with the result that all matters cannot be attended to as promptly as might be desired. So I bespeak your patience when inquiries are not answered quite as promptly as heretofore.

The Board formally approved the elimination of the 1933 convention, and decided that the 1934 convention would of necessity be in skeleton form because of the financial situation of the members. The working out of the particular method to be employed has been left to the Executive Committee, which will make its decision at a meeting that it expects to hold in November.

The status of the Regional Directors whose terms would ordinarily expire this year was taken up with the Institute's counsel, the net result being that the three retiring Directors will send in their resignations as of May 15th and their successors will thereupon take office.

Frederick H. Meyer, of San Francisco, will be succeeded by David J. Witmer, of Los Angeles, as Director for the Sierra Nevada Division.

M. H. Furbringer, of Memphis, will be succeeded by Ralph H. Cameron, of San Antonio, as Director for the Gulf States Division.

Franklin O. Adams, of Tampa, will be succeeded by William T. Warren, of Birmingham, as Director for the South Atlantic Division.

The Officers will continue to serve until the close of the next convention. The President will be ineligible for re-election as he will have served the equivalent of two terms. The work of the Institute will thus continue without interruption unless the dues for 1933 fail entirely.

Reports from the thirty-seven Standing and Special Committees were received and read to the Board, were thoroughly discussed, and then assigned to the various Directors who were requested to express in writing the opinions and wishes of the Board. There was no diminution of quality or character evidenced in any of the reports. They indicated clearly that the Institute is thoroughly alive and working without the slightest loss of interest. As these committees are the backbone of the national work of the Institute, it is gratifying to be able to record their enthusiastic activities. It is hoped that later summaries of these reports, with the comments of the Board thereon, can be published in *THE OCTAGON*.

While the financial situation was of the gravest concern to the Board members, the greatest interest was taken in the report of the Public Works Committee. This report showed that from data available it appears that three hundred and sixty private architects had been engaged under the Federal Building Program, to design public buildings for the Treasury Department, and in addition, sixty-six associates and thirty-one consultants. This was considered a splendid showing. So far as is known, the Treasury Department expects to continue its present policy of employing private architects under the provision of the Keyes-Elliott Bill.

Mr. LaBeaume, Chairman of the Committee on Public Works, met with the Board. He stated that the Bill (H. R. 6187) introduced in the last Congress making it mandatory on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury to employ private architects for all public buildings under his jurisdiction was not brought out of the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and hence it died with the Lame Duck session. Steps will be taken to reintroduce it during the present session of Congress, but it was deemed expedient to await the action of President Roosevelt in consolidating Governmental departments, as it is the opinion that public works will ultimately be placed in the hands of a single

agency, and that the Institute's Bill should be introduced and worded so as to apply to such agency rather than to restrict its provisions to the Treasury Department. Mr. LaBeaume reported that he believed it was possible to secure favorable action because of the widespread interest that had been created since the first introduction of the Bill. At the last session of Congress the House appointed a committee, headed by Mr. Shannon, of Missouri, to investigate the entire matter of governmental competition with private business.

The report of this committee fully justifies the Institute's position, and will be most helpful when the new Bill is introduced.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States has placed itself on record in favor of the employment of private architects for Government work, and many members of both houses in Congress have become alive to the desirability of the changes embodied in our Bill. Mr. LaBeaume and his committee are prepared to do everything necessary to have the bill passed and hope to do so before Congress adjourns for the summer, but realize that this may not be possible because the departments may not be reorganized in time. The efforts of the committee will be unabated once the Bill is introduced. The appropriation for the Public Works Committee had to be materially reduced because of the Institute's financial condition. It may become necessary to call for volunteers to attend hearings on the Bill, and private subscriptions to aid the committee may also be called for. As this is a subject in which the entire membership of the Institute is vitally interested, I feel sure that any calls for help will meet with prompt response.

It was with deepest regret that the Board found it necessary to discontinue after June 30th its appropriation for the Structural Service Department. This Department has accomplished a great deal in bringing about a better understanding between architects and manufacturers. It has accumulated much information that is of value to each practitioner and would in time have become self-supporting, with its value greatly enhanced. The expense of the Department is met in part by the Institute and in part by The Producers' Council. It is hoped that The Producers' Council may continue its appropriation and that the valuable services of F. Leo Smith, Technical Secretary, may be retained on some basis. I am sure that the Council will do its utmost to carry on, but realize that its financial situation closely approximates that of the Institute.

Returning to the subject of finances: The Institute is fortunate in being trustee for a number of special funds and endowments. Under the prescribed conditions for spending those funds, or the income therefrom, it is doing a tremendous amount of valuable work each year for the advancement of Architecture and the Allied Arts.

But the members should bear in mind that these special funds, and the income, are not available for the general operating expenses of the Institute as a national organization.

All of this appears in the financial reports of the Treasurer, but in looking over those reports several items impressed me as worthy of comment here.

For example, in 1932, current dues paid in were \$33,855.00, and dues in arrears paid in were \$16,276.00. The net income from sales of standard documents was \$3,928.00. Adding these three major sources of income, we have a total of \$54,059.00.

Some of the principal items of expense in 1932, to which this income was applied, were as follows:

For partial maintenance of The Octagon property, \$3,867.00. (An additional \$2,967.00 came over from the Property Maintenance Fund for this purpose.) The Institute owns The Octagon, which is an historic monument of architectural merit, designed by William Thornton, Architect, in 1798. It is located at the corner of New York Avenue and Eighteenth Street, in the city of Washington. It is two short blocks from the White House, and is near the center of official life in the nation's capital. Its annual worth to the Institute in keeping the architectural profession in the minds of the nation's leaders cannot be measured. That portion of members' dues expended to maintain the Octagon property in good condition, to pay the taxes and the insurance, is one of the best investments made by the Institute.

For Board and Executive Committee Meetings, \$5,989.00. The Institute has long typified the American principle of representative government. And under our established program there is a meeting of the Board of Directors or the Executive Committee once each quarter—to exercise control and determine policies. They also give opportunity to review work of the Institute and its Committees, to learn of Chapter problems, to extend cooperation and guidance to Chapters and Members.

Last year (and the same will be true in 1933), we had to omit one Executive and one Board meeting, but they should be resumed just as soon as times are better.

The Standing and Special Committees, \$6,780.00. The work of these committees is fundamental. It is carried on with almost nominal appropriations, and it enlists the personal interest and support of more than six hundred members of the Institute. The number of committees—thirty seven—may seem large, but the profession of architecture has many ramifications. Included in this amount are the appropriations for the Committee on Public Works, the Committees which maintain standards of practice, the Jury of Fellows, Committees having to do with City and Regional Planning and Housing, the National Capital, the Schedule of Charges, State Societies, and many others.

Publication of THE OCTAGON, \$5,079.00. This is the Journal of the Institute in simplified form. It is sent each month to every Member, Associate, and Junior, and to the Honorary and Honorary Corresponding Members, also to general subscribers and exchanges—a total list of more than four thousand. It is a message each month from the Institute to the Chapters and to the individual Members. Its purpose is to coordinate our efforts, inform all of accomplishments and developments which they should know, and to foster and maintain the unity of the Institute.

It is essential to our present and future welfare that the architects stand shoulder to shoulder. THE OCTAGON helps to make that an assured thing. While the cost of issuing it amounts to more than \$1.00 per member per year, the Board felt it highly desirable to continue it as a monthly publication. In order to keep the cost down in 1933 some items of interest and of value may have to be omitted. It will, however, give as much as can be given with the funds available.

Other expenditures in 1932 were: The Convention, \$2,022.00; Regional Meetings, \$787.00; Structural Service Department, \$4,797.00 (net to the Institute); Education (administration only) \$248.00; Public Information, \$5,186.00; Octagon Library, \$427.00; Press amortization and interest, \$4,141.00; Construction League Membership, \$300.00. The total of the items in this paragraph is \$17,908.00. The same items in the 1933 Budget will total \$8,075.00. In other words retrenchments throughout the 1933 Budget are drastic.

Net Cost of General Administration, \$13,158.00. This sum includes salaries and all other items of overhead at THE OCTAGON, after the allocation of the overhead costs of certain major activities as established by time card data. This amount will be reduced further in 1933, through the reduction of personnel and salaries.

The items of expense here listed make a total of \$52,781.00, as compared with \$54,059.00 of income from dues and sales of documents. The difference of \$1,278.00 on the expenditure side is to cover many small items, such as recruiting, memberships, and general miscellaneous expenses.

Although there may seem to be a feeling of discouragement through this report, it has been kept in a minor key. As a matter of fact, it is a source of joy to realize that the architects throughout the country are fighting men, with plenty of courage to carry on and with the determination to more thoroughly equip themselves so as to be ready to serve their communities and their clients. The Board members epitomize this feeling to a marked degree. They met squarely the problems placed before them and reaffirmed the vitality of The American Institute of Architects which last year celebrated its seventy-fifth anniversary.

## The Finances of the Institute

BY THE TREASURER—FOR THE BOARD

**T**HE Treasurer has been asked by the Board of Directors to make a brief general statement on finances, with particular reference to the Board's action relating to the proposed reduction of 1933 dues, and to the preservation of the memberships of those in default for 1932 or for 1931 dues, or both.

The Treasurer's report to the membership on finances in entirety will be in the next number.

The statement which follows is set out in considerable detail, for the members should visualize the financial problem which confronted the Board when it considered and acted on proposals to reduce dues, remit dues, and retain the memberships of many who are heavily in arrears.

### *Reduction of Income.*

The year 1932 closed with an operating loss of \$253.67. The income of the Institute, exclusive of gifts, earnings of special funds, and revenue not available for its general expenses, for the last three years was as follows: 1930—\$106,121.41; 1931—\$85,223.72; 1932—\$70,890.15.

At the recent meeting of the Board, in Washington, in March, it was apparent that not more than \$36,328.00 was indicated and could be estimated by the Board as the income for 1933, for similar purposes.

This amount was \$20,488.00 less than the 1933 income anticipated by the Executive Committee last November, when it eliminated the 1933 Convention and cut the 1933 appropriations more than \$15,000.00 below those of 1932.

So the Board immediately was faced with the necessity of reducing the 1933 appropriations, made last November, by \$20,488.00, a total cut of more than \$35,000.00 below the appropriations of 1932.

### *Reduction of Expenses.*

To meet this additional reduction in 1933 income, the Board was obliged to, and will eliminate all Structural Service expense after June 30, 1933; and did immediately discontinue the position of Assistant Executive Secretary, reduce the personnel at THE OCTAGON to the Executive Secretary, two stenographers, one bookkeeper, one junior mail clerk, and janitor; make a second cut in the salary roll of 28% (since January, 1932, the salary roll has been cut 58%, and the staff has been reduced 41%); eliminate the expense of directors' and officers' travelling to Chapters; eliminate the directors' fall meeting; and reduce the appropriations for all committees except those for Public Works and the Construction League to "stationery" expense only.

These reductions aggregated about \$15,000.00. After making them, the Budget appropriations for 1933 still remained more than \$5,000.00 above the expected income.

The Board left this deficit, hoping that more than the estimated income will materialize. In the event it does not do so, the Board authorized the Officers to further reduce salaries, to eliminate appropriations for the Public Information and Public Works Committees, and all financial participation in the Construction League, and to eliminate other committee activities as necessary.

There was no additional source of income in sight, and the little money remaining in the Emergency Reserve Fund was the only source of obtaining additional money during 1933 without resorting to bank loans, which the Board will not undertake. A \$5,000.00 deficit would practically wipe out this reserve.

### *Outstanding Dues.*

The books of the Institute showed that on March 7th—

454 members owed \$33,833.22 for 1933, 1932, and 1931 dues,  
676 members owed \$33,159.75 for 1933 and 1932 dues, and  
1128 members owed \$27,888.00 for 1933 dues only. Hence

2258 members owed \$94,880.97 for dues.

### *Proposed Reduction of Dues.*

The Board had before it letters from twelve Chapters, and from many delinquent members, asking for a reduction in 1933 dues and for a retention of delinquent members.

The Board has no authority to reduce dues nor to change the status of delinquent members. The By-Laws provide that only convention action can do that. But the Board has authority to remit the dues of any member, and such remission would operate as a reduction in that member's dues or to effect his restoration to good standing, as the case might be.

### *Effect of Reduction of Dues.*

Consider the effect of a general reduction in dues—whether by remission or otherwise.

Seven hundred and twenty-six members have paid \$18,150.00 for 1933 dues. To remit any part of 1933 dues generally to all members would have required refunding a similar part to each of the seven hundred and twenty-six members who have paid their 1933 dues in full. A remission of \$10.00 of the dues of each member, and this was one of several suggestions, would have required a refund

of \$7,260.00 to those members who have already paid for 1933. Such a refund would have reduced the estimated income for 1933 by that amount, and made the deficit in sight more than \$12,000.00.

To make up this additional deficit of \$7,260.00 would have required that nearly five hundred other members each pay the suggested reduced dues of \$15.00.

To make up the entire deficit of \$12,000.00 expected, if 1933 dues were remitted to \$15.00, would have required that more than eight hundred other members each pay the suggested reduced dues of \$15.00.

Under present conditions, it was obviously unsafe to have counted upon the fulfillment of these requirements.

#### *Action of the Board.*

Some of the Directors were commissioned by Chapters to stress the advisability of an immediate reduction in dues, and they stated strongly such views. The Board carefully examined the letters before it, hoping it would find assurance in them that any proposed reduced dues would be more generally paid than if they remained at the present figure. No such assurance was found, nor did the long experience of the Institute in collecting dues offer any such assurance.

The members of the Board, without exception, felt that appropriations for 1933 could not be further reduced without entirely breaking down the Institute work, its usefulness to its members, to the profession, and to the public. They were convinced that the necessary income for remaining fundamental work which must be carried on would not be produced by the proposed reduction of dues, under present general financial conditions throughout the country.

Hence, the Board unanimously agreed that it was not possible to make a general remission of any

portion of the 1933 dues, without the danger of doing great injury to the effectiveness and the national standing of the Institute.

#### *Remission for Individuals.*

But the Board desired to continue to aid those individual members of the Institute who have loyally supported it but are unable temporarily to carry their full share of its financial burdens. Therefore, it remitted the 1931 dues and the 1932 dues of those members who are in arrears therefor; provided that such members who desire such remission apply for same in writing and pay their 1933 annual dues to the Institute in full prior to December 31, 1933, by installment or otherwise.

#### *The Opportunity.*

The Board hopes that this opportunity will be used by the members to relieve their burden of dues to the Institute and to retain their memberships. They may pay their 1933 dues in any number of installments, as they wish. By paying their current dues, they will not only retain their full standing in the Institute but will enable the Institute to continue to function and to give service when such service is most needed.

---

These are the actions of the Board after a long full day of earnest and sincere endeavor to find a way to carry out the expressed desire of many members. The results may disappoint some of those members, and the Board regrets that any of its actions should ever have that effect. But it believes that none of those members, if they had gone through that day of endeavor with the Board, could have decided otherwise. We must preserve The American Institute of Architects. We need it today more than ever before.

## The Remission of Dues

### PROCEDURE TO BE FOLLOWED.

#### TO THE MEMBERS:

EVERY Member should read carefully the messages by the President and by the Treasurer, which appear in this number. They give graphic and complete information about the general and financial affairs of the Institute.

The primary purpose of this statement is to advise

everyone concerning the remission of dues in arrears—that is, dues owed for 1932 and 1931.

The three resolutions, which cover the remission of dues, the proposed reduction of dues, and quarterly payment of dues, are as follows:

*Whereas*, The long business depression has seriously affected the architectural profession, resulting, as the Board of Direc-

tors fully realizes, in a situation affecting the membership of the Institute in the matter of payment of dues; be it

*Resolved*, That the Board of Directors hereby remits the dues of those members who are in arrears for annual dues for the years 1931 and 1932, either in whole or in part, depending on their ability to pay the same. Such remission in each case shall be conditioned (a) that the President or the governing board of the Chapter of which the delinquent is a member shall certify his or its judgment as to the ability of the delinquent to pay said dues, either in whole or in part; and (b) that the member in arrears shall pay the annual dues for 1933 to the Institute in full, by installments or otherwise on or before December 31, 1933; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Director of each Division be requested to cooperate with the Chapters in his Division for the purpose of carrying out this program of relief; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Board, having reduced its own and other meetings of the Institute to the minimum required to conduct its affairs; having restricted the activities of the Committees to the lowest possible levels; having given up some Committee and departmental activities in all but name; and having reduced the salaries and the personnel of the administration staff at The Octagon to the lowest possible point that will enable it to continue any sort of adequate service to the members, finds that it cannot remit the 1933 dues, even in part, and still carry on the affairs of the Institute in a manner that it believes the members will require. It is therefore compelled to advise the members that under the existing conditions, no part of the annual dues for 1933 can be remitted, much as it regrets to make that announcement; but

The Treasurer is authorized to give notice to those members who have not paid their 1933 dues to the Institute that they may pay such dues in installments at the rate of \$6.25 quarterly.

Every member in arrears has a right under this resolution to apply for a remission of dues. The procedure to be followed should be uniform, simple, and orderly, as follows:

(1) The member should address a letter to the Secretary of the Institute and send it to the President or governing board of his Chapter, requesting remission of said Institute dues in arrears, in whole or in part. That letter should be attached to a check for \$25.00 covering Institute dues for 1933, or a check of \$6.25 for a quarterly installment thereon.

(2) The President, or governing board of the Chapter, should consider a request on its merits and, if of the opinion that Institute dues in arrears for one or two years should be remitted in whole or in part, should forward the letter to the Secretary of the Institute with a certification thereon, or in a covering letter, to the effect that the remission of Institute dues in arrears, in whole or in part, prior to 1933, is recommended.

(3) Upon receipt of such letter, if the member has enclosed a check in full for 1933 dues, the Secretary will notify him and his Chapter that his dues

for 1931 or 1932 or both, as may be the case, have been remitted by the Board of Directors to such extent requested by the member and recommended in the certification.

If the member has not sent his check in full, the remission of the prior dues cannot be made until he has completed his payment of 1933 dues.

(4) Notice of the action taken by the Institute will be sent in each case to the member concerned, and to the President or governing board of his Chapter.

It was the intention of the Board to make it possible for every member of the Institute indebted for dues for 1931 and/or 1932, and unable to pay them in this emergency, to restore his membership to good standing.

There are many members who are in the fortunate position of having some work in their offices. There are some who have commissions for federal or state projects, and there are others of independent means who have escaped to some extent the disasters of the depression. Those members now have opportunity to render valuable assistance to their brother architects, to their profession, and to the Institute by bringing their accounts up to date.

The resolution places upon Chapter Presidents or Executive Committees the duty of passing on each application on its merits, because of their knowledge of actual conditions. Certification for remission of dues in arrears should not be a matter of form in any instance. The action should be a carefully considered recommendation that the Institute remit all or part of such dues; or a tactful explanation to the applicant that he should make a special effort to adjust his account with the Institute rather than seek a remission of dues.

There is no possible way for the Officers of the Institute to pass fairly upon the merits of individual cases. Therefore, they must depend upon the recommendations of Chapter Presidents and governing boards, and upon the loyalty of the individual Member.

The Board is convinced that the best interests of the Members, the Chapters, and the Institute will be served if a new start is made. It calls upon every Member to accept and support the action of the Board as here outlined.

The welfare of the Institute is involved. By unity of purpose and by adherence to our ideals we shall overcome the difficulties of the present.

FRANK C. BALDWIN,  
Secretary.

## Federal Employment of Private Architects

A REPORT TO THE BOARD.

**T**HE Chairman of the Committee on Public Works, Louis LaBeaume, met with the Board of Directors at the March meeting. He made a comprehensive report on conditions in Washington which have a bearing on the Institute's program to secure by legislation or Executive order the establishment of a permanent governmental policy under which architectural service for Federal buildings will be rendered by private architects and not by government bureaus in Washington.

Some of the high spots touched upon by Mr. LaBeaume in his report to the Board were as follows:

The review which appeared in the February number of *THE OCTAGON*, covers the important activities of the Committee since the Convention.

The Institute's bill, H. R. 6187, directing the employment of private architects, was not reported out at the last Congress by the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. At the hearings on that bill the strongest contention in favor of bureau architecture was that the cost of producing plans and specifications in the Treasury Department is much lower than the fees paid to private architects for similar work. A general statement to disprove this contention was submitted by the Committee, but there was no information or procedure which could be used to check in detail the claims of low government costs, either as to drafting or overhead.

As a matter of fact, to obtain reliable data on the operating costs of the Federal bureaus engaged in architectural work is a task far beyond the scope or power of The American Institute of Architects. The Government's method of bookkeeping has been such that actual costs could not be determined except by a thorough-going official and expensive Congressional investigation.

Costs of private architects are well known and can be verified easily. While complete departmental costs for architectural work are not available, all indications are that such costs are excessive. Any claim by government bureaus of costs lower than in private practice should be substantiated by audited accounts. Any data on comparative costs, with respect to government or state work that may be in the possession of private architects should be furnished to the Institute, as such information will be of great value. On the bases of common sense, and past experience with governmental costs in all fields, the building public and the constructions industry are convinced that the employment of private architects would result in an economy in dollars and cents.

The qualified private architect, because of his knowledge of local conditions as they affect materials, labor, climate, local traditions, and other factors, is much better equipped to produce a well-designed building at less cost to the taxpayers than an agency in Washington remote from the field of construction.

The report of the Congressional Committee which investigated government competition with private enterprise, Joseph B. Shannon, Chairman, was a complete and decisive justification of the Institute's position with respect to the Federal employment of private architects. The Shannon report was reviewed in the March number of *THE OCTAGON*.

The profession should recognize and commend the progressive attitude of the Treasury Department with respect to the employment of private architects during the past eighteen months. This more liberal policy resulted from the approval of public opinion accorded the Institute's position, and from the Department's realization that the Federal building program could not be expedited unless private architects were engaged.

Three hundred and sixty projects out of a total of 1,224 have been assigned to private architects.

In connection with these projects, sixty-six associates and thirty-one consulting architects were also appointed, in addition to the principals.

Of the total of 1,224 projects, those reserved by the Office of the Supervising Architect number six hundred and seventy. One hundred and ninety-four projects remain unassigned either to private architects or to the Office of the Supervising Architect.

It is understood that all projects not assigned to private architects or to the Office of the Supervising Architect have been held up by the new Administration in order to determine their bearing on any general public works program which may be put into effect as a relief measure. Those desiring detailed information about pending projects in their states may address communications direct to the Acting Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department.

The Committee on Public Works is prepared to re-introduce in Congress the Institute's bill for the employment of private architects, in the general form of the previous bill—H. R. 6187. The time of introduction will be governed by developments in Washington, with particular reference to the reorganization of the Federal departments.

Such reorganization is now in the making. It will be accomplished by Executive order and will probably be sweeping in character and extent.

Communications have been addressed to President Roosevelt, to Postmaster General James Farley, to Director of the Budget Douglas and others, in which the position of the Institute is fully set forth, with the recommendation that those bureaus and agencies of the Federal government now engaged in the construction of public works be placed under an Administrator of Public Works, whose duty it would be to administer and supervise, and to delegate to architects and engineers in private practice the performance of professional services in the making of plans and the writing of specifications. Conferences have been had with men in close touch with the Administration who are engaged in perfecting the reorganization plan. It is hoped that the final outcome will be a full recognition of the principles for which the Institute has been contending for many years.

After hearing the Chairman's report, and dis-

cussing the many phases involved therein, the Board took action as follows:

*Resolved*, As the sense of the meeting, that proposed legislation similar in principle to H. R. 6187, a bill for the Federal employment of private architects and engineers, be introduced in the Senate and House at the proper time, under the auspices of the Institute, and that every effort be made to secure its enactment.

Action under this resolution was left to the discretion of the Committee on Public Works, both with respect to the scope of the bill and the time of its introduction.

*Resolved*, That the Board heartily commends the action and the program of the Committee on Public Works, and the personal attention given to this subject by the Chairman of the Committee;

That the Board specially commends the Chairman, Louis LaBeaume, and the other members who testified before the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, with respect to proposed legislation in the last Congress; and

That it entrusts the future of this legislation with great confidence to the care of the Committee on Public Works.

## The Schools and the New Architecture

NOTE: The following comments have been received on Mr. Gray's article in the February number of THE OCTAGON.

*By Hubert G. Ripley, F. A. I. A.*

Reference is made (to borrow an expression of the Acting Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department) to Mr. George Gray's article in the February number of THE OCTAGON on "Schools and the New Architecture."

It is with a considerable degree of hesitancy that I venture to express an opinion in advance of the distinguished deans of New England's great architectural schools. It is only the expression of Mr. Gray's hope, "that others may not be reticent," and the fact that recently I was privileged to hear a discussion on this subject participated in by two of the deans in question and a number of other distinguished speakers as well, that lends me courage to proceed. At the meeting referred to, proponents of the schools came off rather well. They seemed to have the best of the debate. Mr. Gray's article starts off a bit vaguely, perhaps, in his premises, but it ends up clearly, logically, and concisely. I am heartily in accord with the spirit of his summation of remedies and suggestions.

There seems to be a general impression that there is something wrong in the teaching of Architecture, in spite of the fact that many noted men, educators, architects of outstanding reputation, and others have declared that the United States leads the world in architectural achievement. These statements may well be debatable, for, if there is something

wrong, are the results of our methods of teaching as satisfactory as we are so complacently assured? There is no question but what the methods pursued at the Ecole de Beaux Arts are superior to those in the United States. In so far as our schools adhere to the French system, they are sound. The basic principle, that time devoted for the study of Architecture between the ages of fifteen and thirty, is logical. As a general thing, after the student has finished a college education, he is too old, his mind lacks plasticity and he has accumulated too many prejudices to begin the study of Architecture. Grab 'em while they're young, and if they don't like it, they'll get out before it's too late. If then, at the age of twenty-two or three, he undertakes that study, his pre-conceived notions hamper an orderly development. If, on the other hand, he takes up the study of Architecture at the same time attempting to acquire a university education, and gallop through it in four, five, or six years, he has such a tremendous amount of required courses to pass that his efforts are so diffused and involved that there is insufficient time to do anything thoroughly and well. It seems to be a mistake to have an architectural school in connection with a college or a university. They should be entirely divorced, and the last thing that should be allowed is, that the faculty or governing board of a university or college should have any control whatever, either in policy or scholastic standards over a school of Fine Arts. A degree, or

a diploma in Architecture should not be dependent on certain marks that a student must attain in subjects not closely related to the practice of the profession.

There are one or two minor points in Mr. Gray's article that I should like to question. He speaks rather slurringly and dismisses with a word or two that kindly, scholarly, distinguished, and thoroughly great artist, M. Vitruvius Pollio. It is true that Vitruvius devotes a portion of his great work to formulae and rules for the design of temples and other buildings, but the larger part of his writing is devoted to the philosophy and appreciation of Art. Those who follow only his mathematical and analytical study of "modules" and "parts," and neglect the more important admonitions contained in his great work will achieve a dry, meaningless result. If only the precepts of Chapter 2, Book 1 were followed, modern architecture would be as virile, sig-

nificant, and dynamic today as it ever was in the great periods.

I like what Mr. Gray says about beauty, although his reasoning confuses me a little, and I like his general conclusions on the method for teaching the study and practice of Architecture.

*By Dean Wm. A. Boring, F. A. I. A., of the Department of Architecture, Columbia University.*

I am in sympathy with the ideas you announce. As evidence of that, I would say that nearly all of them have already been incorporated in our method of teaching.

It is not easy to carry out what we know should be done with the teachers we are able to employ and pay. Columbia is not in the big football game of wrestling for prizes only. We are going in primarily for the education of the architect.

## Preparation For the Practice of Architecture

By C. C. ZANTZINGER, F. A. I. A.

In November last there was held in New York a meeting at which were present many men interested in education preparatory to the practice of architecture. While all of these men are members of the Institute, they individually represented: the Committee on Education, A. I. A., the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture, the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards, and the Beaux-Arts Institute of Design.

Their discussion of this important subject is a matter of major interest to the profession. The following is an extract from the minutes of the meeting:

In May, 1932, the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture invited representatives of the four organizations named above to attend a special session of its annual meeting. The possibilities of cooperative action to further a proper coordination of the various steps involved in preparing for the practice of architecture were discussed. Two motions were adopted. The first was to approve the revised regulations for membership in the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture as submitted by that body. The second was to authorize a joint committee to initiate plans for permanent collaboration between the four organizations. As a consequence of the second motion, the present conference was called by Chairman Butler of the Education Committee of the A. I. A. The following individuals were present:

F. H. BOSWORTH, JR., ALBERT L. BROCKWAY, CHARLES BUTLER, WILLIAM EMERSON, ELMORY STANFORD HALL, ROY CHILDS JONES, ELY JACQUES KAHN, M. I. KAST, ELLIS F. LAWRENCE, EVERETT V. MEEKS, SHERLEY W. MORGAN, GEORGE C. NIMMONS and C. C. ZANTZINGER.

Mr. Butler was elected chairman of the meeting, and he appointed Mr. Jones to act as secretary.

The chairman invited discussion, at the pleasure of

the conference, on any or all of the topics listed on the suggested agenda sent out in advance.

A paragraph from a report submitted at the conference in May was introduced as a keynote for the present discussion:

"Let the teaching and professional agencies collaborate more fully in whatever future plans are made regarding the training of architects and their admission to practice. Let the schools give men their preliminary training, and let the profession determine its standards for admission to practice. But perhaps the interlocking character of these two functions can be recognized more fully, by official or unofficial action. If the Institute's Educational Committee could act somewhat in the capacity of the American Medical Association's Council on Education; if it could be represented on the committees charged with the examination and inspection of the schools, if in collaboration with the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture, it could prepare its own list of schools professionally acceptable; we need not continue the 'ifs'—The subject is now before you."

Mr. Zantzinger expressed his own sense of the extremely important possibilities that lay in the actions this group might take. Whether or not the preparatory steps toward practice should head toward making A. I. A. membership synonymous with qualification for practice, which was his own hope, or not, he urged a concerted effort to formulate definite plans that would look toward as completely coordinated a system of preparation as had been achieved in the medical profession. He believed the mechanism of that system might hold suggestions for us. In addition to the Council on Education of the American Medical Association, there existed also a National Board of Medical Examiners. This, originally self-created, was by now composed of twenty-seven members, selected from various groups, including American Medical Association members elected at large, and representatives of the Council on Education, the Association of Medical Schools, the Public Health Service, and the Army and Navy.

This board had in the course of time set up examinations whose successful passing led to a designation as "Diplomatic" (D. N. B.). Although the board was entirely extra-legal, its prestige had become sufficient to cause nearly all state examining boards to accept its examinations as equivalent or superior to their own, whereby interstate registration was enormously simplified. This board issued and conducted examinations. The cost was defrayed partly by fees from the examinees, partly by subsidies from foundations. The examinations now consisted of three parts as follows:

Part I—Open to candidates who had completed four years high school plus two years of pre-medical college work, plus two years medical school.

Part II—Open to candidates who had passed Part I and completed four years medical school.

Part III—Open to candidates who had passed Part II and completed their hospital internships.

A recent development had been that some schools have utilized Parts I and II of the National Board examinations for their regular comprehensive exams at the end of the two and four year periods. Thus, if he passed the Board's grading, the student was credited with completion of Parts I and II.

Mr. Zantzinger's own opinion was that all this might offer a suggestion for our own procedure. Might not the existing machinery of schools and N. C. A. R. B. be utilized to determine a class of "diplomates" in architecture with corresponding privileges?

The implications of this idea were discussed generally. The scheme of dividing the examination into several well-defined parts, some of which were coincident with school training, and some with practical training, seemed to find favor. Mr. Brockway, supported by others, stressed the very obvious lack of any mechanism in architecture to correspond to the organized internship in medicine. If any parallel system were to be set up, serious consideration of this question, already raised as one of the major objectives of this group, must be faced.

At this point Mr. Hall outlined the accomplishment to date of the N. C. A. R. B. in setting up a standard examination for practice in architecture. The significance for the conference appeared to lie in the fact that the N. C. A. R. B. had been in operation for twelve years, had already a certain legal status by virtue of having its membership constituted in the legally appointed state boards themselves (38 state boards were members), and had done a vast amount of work in formulating procedures and examinations as standards to be striven for by these same boards. The Board acted as a clearing house for information to the profession and the state boards about registration matters in general; it concerned itself with determining standards to apply to school and office experience; it was the only agency to facilitate interstate registration; it issued exams, to be given by state boards, designed to satisfy the varied requirements of all states to such a degree that their successful completion practically assured interstate registration. That the profession generally, and many members of this group particularly, had been unaware of the vast amount of work that had been done was considered striking and regrettable.

Mr. Lawrence's question as to the propriety of the political or governmental control of standards for practice implicit in the N. C. A. R. B. set-up was answered by Mr. Bosworth and Mr. Brockway by arguing that all licensing, if admitted at all, must be governmental in essence, and that governmental standards were not necessarily at odds with professional, being, on account

of the composition of state boards, practically dictated by the professional in any case.

Out of the general discussion engendered by Mr. Hall's exposition, certain definite ideas began to crystallize. Mr. Zantzinger believed it should be recommended that the schools and the N. C. A. R. B. jointly conduct periodic exams for students corresponding to Parts I and II of the medical exams, the present N. C. A. R. B. exams to be used with necessary changes of details and organization. Mr. Meeks suggested then the extension of this idea to include a final exam corresponding to the medical board's Part III coming after an organized internship.

Mr. Kahn urged strongly that in these various plans, under which a chain of school requirements seemed to be taking such rigidly definite shape, the large and frequently promising group of men without school experience should not be lost sight of. His own experience led him to believe it extremely important that these men should not be debarred from practice by lack of school training per se.

Mr. Hall stressed two chief questions to which the N. C. A. R. B. was struggling to find an answer. One was how to determine the list of accredited schools. The other was how to organize an internship for architects—a matter assuredly not so simple as in medicine. He added that the epitome of the Board's experience was that in 75 per cent of cases the first year's practical experience was wasted.

Mr. Hall stated two objectives sought by the N. C. A. R. B. in securing which the Board would appreciate everybody's cooperation, namely (1) to bring the schools closer to the examining agencies, and (2) to organize an internship on a different financial basis from the present one, with the emphasis on all round training for practice rather than on draftsmanship, the candidate definitely registering himself as such at a standard remuneration based on living expenses only.

On Mr. Brockway's motion it was voted:

*It is the sense of this meeting that necessary machinery to bring the four groups represented to a common aim should be set up immediately.*

On Mr. Kahn's motion it was voted:

*An advisory committee shall be organized by this conference to effect a liaison between the registration boards and those agencies interested in preparation for the practice of architecture.*

On Mr. Hall's motion it was voted:

*The chairman of this conference shall appoint a committee to prepare a resolution to be presented at the next session which will definitize the setting up of such an advisory committee.*

On re-convening, the committee appointed for the purpose presented the following resolution, which was unanimously voted:

*Be it resolved that:*

*For the purpose of coordinating the work of those agencies having to do with the training and examining of candidates for the practice of architecture, the following individuals constitute themselves a Committee on Preparation for the Practice of Architecture:*

F. H. BOSWORTH, JR.	M. I. KAST
ALBERT L. BROCKWAY	ELLIS F. LAWRENCE
CHARLES BUTLER	EVERETT V. MEEKS
WILLIAM EMERSON	SHERLEY W. MORGAN
EMORY STANFORD HALL	GEORGE C. NIMMONS
ROY CHILDS JONES	C. C. ZANTZINGER
ELY JACQUES KAHN	

*(Being members of the A. I. A. Committee on Education, the A. C. S. A., and the B. A. I. D.)*

Be it further resolved that:

As soon as practicable the Committee secure the endorsement of the four organizations represented by its membership, and of such other organizations as it may be found desirable to include, to the end that a permanent organization may be set up.

It was voted:

It is the sense of this meeting that the minimum training period prescribed by the N. C. A. R. B. for candidates for admission to practice should be increased from two to three years.

Two specific topics, (1) the division of the examinations into two parts with their consequent possible revision, one part to be given in collaboration with the schools, and the other after an apprenticeship, and (2) the management of the apprenticeship period, it was agreed should be referred to the executive committee authorized by the action that immediately followed.

It was voted:

The chairman of the conference shall appoint an Executive Committee which shall act for the time being to study plans and policies, and in general to centralize the activities of the Committee on Preparation for Practice.

The chairman thereupon appointed the following executive committee of seven members:

1. C. C. ZANTZINGER, chairman
2. EMORY STANFORD HALL
3. ELY JACQUES KAHN
4. CHARLES BUTLER
5. WILLIAM EMERSON
6. ROY CHILDS JONES
7. .... (Vacancy for later appointment)

ROY CHILDS JONES, *Secretary pro tem.*

The further deliberations of this Committee have demonstrated the importance of collaboration by the whole profession in setting up the high standards for the preparation for practice that are the only ones that the profession as a whole can or should endorse. Securing recognition of the importance of this whole subject by the profession will, therefore, constitute one of the principal activities of the Committee who will presently bring to the attention of the profession a comprehensive plan of education which in application should have far-reaching results.

## Shopping for Bids and Bid Peddling

To the Members:

IN the January number, under the heading "Shopping for Bids and Bid Peddling"—page 39—there was published a description and definite outline of the so-called Huddleston Plan—a plan intended to avoid or mitigate the evils of bid shopping and bid peddling.

Interested members are requested to review the Huddleston Plan, and then to consider the so-called "Nashville Plan" which appears below.

Mr. W. F. Creighton, author of the article, and an advocate of the Nashville Plan, is Chairman of the Building Contract Committee of the Associated General Contractors.

Members are requested to send their approval, comments, or objections—on either plan, or on both plans—to the Chairman of the Institute's Committee on Joint Building Practices, William Stanley Parker, 120 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.

FRANK C. BALDWIN, *Secretary.*

### THE NASHVILLE PLAN

To reach any proper solution of the so-called bid peddling evil, it should be realized that the seller, as well as the buyer, is responsible. To conclude that the general contractor, subcontractor, jobber, or manufacturer, is solely to blame; or that any single element of the building industry—including the architect—may correct this evil, is a mistake. It requires cooperative and determined action. It is a fundamental principle of business that the seller must enforce his terms of sale, but it has been

proven, in the building industry, that he cannot do so as an individual or in groups, without the buyers's help. Both know that their business life depends on a profit, but they must be forced to a realization that neither may earn it at the expense of the other.

This principle is the basis of the Nashville plan. It is a modification of Article 6, of the Code of Bidding Practice, prepared by a joint committee of the American Institute of Architects, and the Associated General Contractors. One important clause is omitted; which is, to require the general contractor to furnish each subcontractor a bid blank, which would insure that the bids of each trade will be identical except the price. The plan is extremely simple, and does not necessitate any change in the customary procedure.

Briefly, the essential feature is that every general contractor must submit a sealed list of the names of subcontractors he has used, to some agency acceptable to both buyer and seller.

To avoid any legal complications, no general contractor is excluded, regardless of size, locality, color, etc. If he submit the list, and agrees to other simple terms of their bidding practice, he is given every consideration, but if he will not agree, he does not receive a bid from any member of the subcontractor's organization. If he should secure the contract, none of them will accept any work from him. He may prepare the estimate on any trade, and list his own name, but must be prepared to do the work with his forces, because the subcontractors are not al-

lowed to take the work, without the consent of their organization.

Practically all the responsible subcontractors in the territory are members of the organization, and sales managers of many nationally used materials and specialties, encourage their local representatives to cooperate, so that it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to finish a commercial building of any magnitude, without the help of these subcontractors.

An effort is being made to persuade material dealers to cooperate. If this is successful, it is reasonably certain that bid peddling and price cutting will cease in this territory.

If the subcontractor cuts his price, or accepts work from a general contractor who does not subscribe to the plan, he is expelled from the organization, and the general contractors do not request future bids from him.

The plan has been in operation in the Nashville territory for more than a year. It is satisfactory to buyer and seller. With one or two exceptions, every general contractor has been forced to agree, and one or two subcontractors, who have "kicked over the traces" have seen their error, and have come back. It is reasonable to assume that if it has succeeded during the present period of keen competition, it will be more satisfactory when business improves.

The main result is that the general contractor must add a profit to his estimate, if he expects one, because he cannot earn a profit by trading and peddling his sub-bids. The subcontractor must quote his best price, because he will have no opportunity to reduce it. When the general bid is tendered, all trading is over, unless changes are made in the plans and specifications, and it is difficult to use changes as a subterfuge to peddle. It does not interfere with the existing relationship between individual subcontractors and general contractors. Since prices are not made public, a subcontractor is not bound to give every general contractor the same price. If he has learned from past experience that a general contractor cooperates with him in the execution of his work, pays him promptly, and is solvent, he may quote him a lower price than others. To prevent collusion between members of

the trade, a joint committee is empowered to check prices which are excessive and has authority to require the trade involved to reduce the price to a proper figure, or permit the general contractor to take any steps he desires, to do so.

It is not thought proper, as is contemplated in other localities, to depend on the architect to correct the trouble. General contractors have learned that with a weak architect and a selfish owner—who profits thereby—that bid peddling and ruthless buying will be more severe if the architect and owner selects the subcontractor, than at present, and the subcontractor so selected, without the consent of the general contractor, would be very unsatisfactory.

It has been interesting to watch the workings of human nature under this plan. Many subcontractors make every effort to ascertain their competitor's price before the general bid is tendered, in order to bid lower, but since the reduction of a sub price, before the general bid is tendered, does not profit the general contractor, there is no reason for him to give one subcontractor's price to another. Some subcontractors have requested the general contractor to submit their names on each job, and agree to meet any price quoted by their competitors. This does not succeed, because the general contractor realizes that a high sub-price is of no help in getting his bid in line.

It has been said that the Nashville Plan would not succeed in larger cities, but it is the writer's belief, that if the buyer and seller are convinced that the present condition is the cause of many bankruptcies, and to some extent the decreased volume of construction, it would be extremely simple to effect organizations in any city of whatever size, to enforce it.

There is an additional reason for a determined effort to stop price cutting at this time. We may not expect an increase in building construction until the members of the industry and the public are convinced that building costs are stable. It may seem that there is no demand for construction, but the past has shown that when capital is convinced that prices have reached bottom, it seeks investment.

W. F. CREIGHTON, *Chairman,*  
*Building Contact Committee, A. G. C.*

#### BIDDING PRACTICE OF NASHVILLE CONTRACTORS ASSOCIATION, APPROVED FEBRUARY, 1932

##### *Agreed to by Fifty-one General Contractors*

The general contractor shall give the subcontractor the same consideration that he expects from the architect.

1. The subcontractor should submit bids to general contractors, only when invited to do so.
2. All sub bids shall be in the hands of the general

contractors the day before the general bids are to be opened.

3. All sub bids received on the day of the opening shall be returned unopened.

4. The general contractor shall at the same time he submits his bid to the architect or owner, submit a list of the subcontractors he proposes to use in the performance of his contract, to the Secretary of the Nashville Contractors Association who shall return, unopened,

the lists submitted by the unsuccessful contractors, after the award of the general contract.

5. When the general contractor prepares his own estimates on subcontract work, he shall so indicate in the list of subcontractors.

6. Contractors should exercise every care not to expose bids submitted by subcontractors before or after the opening of bids, even if the general contractor was not successful. It is confidential information, and should be treated as such.

7. The general contractor and subcontractor should agree in advance on amount due subcontractor on each monthly estimate, and unless this is cut by the architect, subcontractors should receive said amount in accordance with his contract.

8. If subcontractors consider that they are being unfairly treated by general contractors, they should decline to figure further with such general contractor.

9. All subcontract proposals shall be valid and binding for a period of ten (10) days after the general bids have been opened. After this time subcontractor's bids may be withdrawn with notice.

#### *This pertains to (2) and (3) of the Agreement*

That all members of the Chapter (A. G. C.) adhere strictly to the time limit for receiving sub bids on work, interpreting twenty-four hours to mean the last day before the opening of the bids; that bids from out of town be accepted provided they were in the mail the day before, as shown by post office cancellation marks; provided that mailed bids shall not apply to local contractors and local material supply dealers; and that copies of this motion be mailed to each member of the Nashville Chapter, Associated General Contractors.

### Architects on Memorial Day

The Philadelphia Chapter in 1932 created a new committee, the function of which is, on behalf of the Chapter, to honor the memory of some of its distinguished departed members through the placing of a token of respect on their graves in connection with Memorial Day observance. Other chapters have conducted similar services.

So far as known this remembrance of noted architects originated with the Washington, D. C., Chapter, where the Memorial Day services have been held for some years past with a view to their reactions—not only upon the public—but upon the morale of the architectural profession. It is regarded as an attempt to recapture the spirit in which the

mediaeval guild entered in a familiar way into the lives of its members. They were evidently like a big family and, while the present attitude of the profession is less intimate, architects today can at least emulate their good feeling for each other—alive or dead. These Memorial Testimonials would seem to be one excellent way to foster that spirit and to give some tangible evidence of respectful appreciation.

Chapters planning memorial services will be interested in reviewing Vice President Peaslee's brief article on page 23 of the May, 1932, number of THE OCTAGON.

### Construction League—Policy Committee Meeting

The Policy Committee of the Construction League of the United States will hold its spring meeting in Chicago on June 29, 1933.

Consideration will be given to many of the vital problems confronting the construction industry at this critical period of adjustment—a

period of planning for a more united industry which will, as business improves, enable its constituent groups to cooperate more efficiently in solving mutual problems and also enable it to coordinate its activities so as to serve more effectively all concerned.

### Cincinnati Building Code

Architects, engineers, builders and real estate interests recognize the necessity for uniformity and standardization of building codes. Valuable contributions have been made to this subject by technical organizations and governmental agencies but there has been little effort to coordinate and utilize these recommendations in the preparation of state and local codes and ordinances.

One of the most comprehensive codes which has come to our attention is the recently adopted Building Code of the City of Cincinnati. This code is the result of seven years exhaustive study of existing building legislation. Cincinnati architects took an active part in its preparation.

The "Recommended Practice for Arrangement

of Building Codes", published in 1925 by the Department of Commerce, was used as a basis for selection of subcommittees assigned to compile the various chapters of the code. The chairmen of these subcommittees formed a coordinating committee under the chairmanship of the Commissioner of Buildings and, in addition, committees from various local organizations cooperated in the work.

Regulations relating to building construction, occupancy, and equipment are covered in nineteen chapters, logically arranged to assist in locating desired information.

The completeness and coordination represented in the Cincinnati Building Code might well serve as the basis for building legislation in other cities.

## The Structural Service Department

F. LEO SMITH, TECHNICAL SECRETARY

Devoted to the advancement of knowledge of materials, methods of construction, and equipment for buildings, and to a better understanding of the art and science of architecture.

### Producers' Council Annual Meeting.

The Tenth Annual Meeting of The Producers' Council, Incorporated, will be held in Chicago, Illinois, June 27th and 28th, 1933. Detailed plans for the meeting have not yet been announced but it is the intention to perfect arrangements well in advance of the selected dates to afford Council members, architects, and others interested, ample opportunity to participate.

The Chicago Chapter of the Institute and the Illinois Society of Architects are to be invited to take part in the proceedings, and the active cooperation of the Producers' Council Club of Chicago is assured.

W. E. Hart, of the Portland Cement Association, Chicago member of the Board of Directors of the Council, will act as Chairman of the Committee on Arrangements.

Meetings of several construction industry groups have been scheduled for the week of the Council meeting, which should arouse considerable interest and provide an additional incentive for a large attendance.

### Producers' Council Club Activities.

Both architects and producers have evidenced a keen interest in joint meetings of the Producers' Council Clubs with local Chapters of the Institute. Clubs have been established in Boston, Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Detroit, Los Angeles, New York, Philadelphia, San Francisco and St. Louis and other clubs will be organized in principal cities as soon as conditions warrant.

The Producers' Council Club of Boston sponsored a very interesting meeting which was held at the Engineers Club in Boston on April 6, 1933. Mr. Ralph W. Gray, A.I.A., President of the Boston Society of Architects, cooperated with the committee in planning for the meeting and all members of the Boston Society were invited to attend. Mr. Harvey Wiley Corbett, F.A.I.A. gave the principal address on the architectural and engineering features of Radio City, and Mr. Harold B. Willis, A.I.A., spoke on his experiences in escaping from a German prison camp during the War.

The March luncheon and program of the Producers' Council Club of Chicago was held on March 21, 1933 at Maillard's. "Aladdin's Lamp Up to Date" was the subject of an address by Mr. H. D. Sanborn of the General Electric Company. Mr.

Sanborn spoke on and demonstrated the thyatron tube, a device which will be used to operate many of the spectacular electrical features at the Century of Progress Exposition.

"Construction Policies for the Revival of the Building Industry" was the subject of a most successful forum held at the Architectural League of New York on March 16, 1933, under the joint auspices of the Architectural League and The Producers' Council Club of New York. The meeting was attended by approximately one hundred and ten New York architects, contractors and producers. Mr. Julian Clarence Levi, President of the League, opened the meeting and introduced Mr. Leon V. Solon, Chairman of the League's Committee on Current Work, who presided. Mr. W. L. Keplinger, Governor of the New York Club, introduced the scheduled speakers.

Mr. Lewis H. Brown, President of Johns-Manville Corporation, and Mr. Rolland J. Hamilton, President of American Radiator Company, opened the discussion for the Producers. They were followed by Mr. John Lowry, President of John Lowry, Incorporated, and Mr. John R. Kilpatrick, Vice President of the George A. Fuller Company, for the contractors; and Mr. R. H. Shreve of Shreve, Lamb and Harmon, and Mr. Stephen F. Voorhees, of Voorhees, Gmelin and Walker, for the architects.

The complete text of the talks given by Mr. Brown and Mr. Hamilton may be obtained in mimeograph form upon request to The Producers' Council office, 19 West 44th Street, New York, New York.

Messrs. Ely Jacques Kahn, William H. Gompert, Electus D. Litchfield and John Taylor Boyd, Jr., contributed interesting and constructive comments. The significance of the meeting was well expressed by Mr. Kahn who described it as a revelation of the splendid progress made in the cooperative relations between architects, contractors, and producers, meeting together for frank and serious discussion of the common problems of the industry. Such a gathering, for such a purpose would not have been considered possible a few short years ago, and Mr. Kahn saw in it a good omen with great opportunity for the building industry.

### Clay in Concrete.

An investigation of the effects of clay admixtures on the compressive strength, permeability and dura-

bility of concrete is being conducted at the National Bureau of Standards.

Concretes of three different proportions have been tested. The first contained no clay and the other two concretes which were mixed to the same consistency as the first group (based on the penetration test), were of the same proportions, except that in one instance clay was substituted for ten per cent of the volume of the cement, and in another, clay was substituted for seven and one-half per cent of the volume of the sand. Three complete sets of specimens were made of each type of concrete, using three different brands of cement. In addition, three complete sets of those containing clay were made, each with a different kind of clay, making a total of twenty-one mixtures.

Specimens of each mixture were made for testing and compression at seven and twenty-eight days; three, six and nine months; and one, two and three years.

It was found that the replacement of seven and one-half per cent of the volume of the sand by an equal volume of clay materially increased the compressive strength. Tests at the end of nine months indicated that the permeability was decreased but later tests indicated an increase in permeability both actually and relative to that of plain concrete without the clay admixture. It should be noted, however, that all of the concretes were practically impermeable.

A decrease in strength of from zero to ten per cent resulted in the case of the Portland cement concrete through substitution of clay for ten per cent of the volume of the cement, except for the first two or three months. No appreciable change was noted in the slight permeability of these specimens.

The difference in absorption, permeability and resistance to freezing and thawing between concretes containing and those not containing clay were negligible.

A complete report of the investigation has been published as Research Paper No. 529, which appeared in the February issue of the Bureau of Standards "Journal of Research".

#### **Connectors for Timber Construction.**

The stability of a wood structure is largely dependent upon the effectiveness of the method of joining the timbers of which it is composed. Recognizing the difficulty of obtaining adequate joints by means of generally known devices, architects and engineers have been unwilling to risk possible failures, in some instances avoiding timber construction because of the uncertainty of the connections.

The National Committee on Wood Utilization of the United States Department of Commerce,

with the cooperation of the Forest Products Laboratory of the United States Department of Agriculture and the National Bureau of Standards, undertook a joint investigation of European practice in timber construction and a painstaking study was made of various types of wood and metal connectors which constitute the principal feature of this new development. Data on more than sixty different types of connectors were obtained and studied. The Forest Products Laboratory made tests on some of the more important types, and the Bureau of Standards made a special analysis of the physical composition of metal parts. The information obtained has been compiled in the form of a comprehensive report entitled "Modern Connectors for Timber Construction", issued jointly by the National Committee on Wood Utilization and the Forest Products Laboratory.

This report was sponsored by a subcommittee of leading engineers, architects, and builders representing professional and trade associations interested in building and construction. It contains 147 pages of text and 83 illustrations explaining the application of this system to American construction practice, gives the results of tests of these connectors with American woods, and demonstrates the use of modern connectors for timber construction.

#### **Standards Year Book-1933**

The 1933 edition of the Standards Year Book of the United States Department of Commerce is now available. This volume contains an outline of the standardization activities and accomplishments of national technical societies and trade associations, as well as those of the Bureau of Standards and other agencies of the Federal and local governments. Methods employed by these agencies for making their standards and specifications effective throughout industry have been included in the outlines.

The standardization activities of The American Institute of Architects are covered briefly with reference to the issuing of standard forms and documents, and the cooperation of the Institute in the work of committees dealing with the standardization of building materials and appliances.

#### **Proceedings—International Commission on Illumination**

Through the courtesy of G. H. Stickney, Secretary-Treasurer of the United States National Committee of the International Commission on Illumination, the Institute has been presented with a copy of the Proceedings of the International Commission on Illumination Sessions, Cambridge, England, 1931.

This is a cloth bound volume of 694 pages, covering reports of the Secretariat, discussions in committees, papers read and resolutions adopted, the text being in French, English, and German.

## With the Chapters

EXTRACTS FROM CHAPTER MINUTES AND REPORTS

### Baltimore Chapter.

At the March meeting of the Baltimore Chapter, the four subjects receiving major consideration were, (1) the Housing Bill; (2) the Arbitration Bill; (3) the Unemployment Insurance Bill;—all three of which are being considered by or are to be presented to the Maryland Legislature—and (4) cooperation with the Architects' Emergency Relief Committee of New York, in gathering material for the book, "Great Georgian Houses of America."

The Baltimore Building Congress is cooperating with the Chapter in its efforts to secure the legislation proposed in the above mentioned Bills.

### Boston Chapter.

At the March meeting of the Boston Chapter (Boston Society of Architects), the subject of the evening, "Architects as Promoters," brought forth discussion but no very thoroughly thought out plans.

Hugh Perrin pointed out that it was unlikely to find an architect good at design and also good at promotion but that the two functions should be combined, however, in some way under architectural control.

It was suggested that a good architect was best fitted to judge the merits of a scheme of real estate promotion. This involves design in the sense of beauty and utility taken together, and finance both in raising money and in proving the scheme by its success.

Various opinions were expressed in regard to these matters. But there was agreement in regard to the present condition of large scale housing as being more often bad than good, and that it had escaped altogether from the control of architects, much to its detriment.

It was pointed out that large-scale housing schemes employ architects, but others objected stating that architects should be in control, not employed.

There was a general feeling that there should be more readiness in the profession to enter schemes of promotion.

At the February meeting the announced subject for discussion—"Wise Use of the Competition Code"—brought forth many interesting comments. A resume of these comments was printed in the February issue of the Bulletin of the Boston Society of Architects (Charles H. Cogswell, Editor, 6 Beacon Street, Boston, Massachusetts).

William G. Perry, of the firm of Perry, Shaw & Hepburn, gave an illustrated talk on "The Progress of the Restoration of Williamsburg,

Virginia," which work was undertaken through the public-spirited generosity of Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr. Mr. Perry expressed his profound respect for Mr. Rockefeller, who was impressed by the argument that there was enough to preserve and a purpose in preserving it. Mr. Rockefeller's motive, he said, was not only historical and architectural, but also philosophical.

### Central Illinois Chapter.

The March meeting of the Central Illinois Chapter was in the nature of a memorial meeting honoring Professor James M. White, F. A. I. A., Chairman of the Institute's Committee on Registration Laws, Dean of the College of Engineering and Supervising Architect of the University of Illinois, whose untimely death occurred February 6th.

The meeting was held in Professor White's private office in the Administration Building of the University. A memorial resolution was adopted and each member in attendance spoke of Professor White, all revealing the deep interest he took in others, his broad vision, and his ever willingness to help where help was needed.

### Chicago Chapter.

Prior to the business meeting of the Chapter, March 14 dinner was served to seventy-five members and guests. As President Farrier was absent, on account of illness, Alfred Granger, a Past President, presided over the meeting.

William J. Smith, Chairman of the Program Committee, reported on a program which indicated interesting meetings of the Chapter for April, May, and June.

L. W. Hurd, a member of the San Francisco Chapter, and Mr. J. C. Boles, an architect from Budapest, Hungary, were guests and were introduced to the Chapter.

Professor Rexford Newcomb, member of the Central Illinois Chapter, and dean of the College of Fine Arts, University of Illinois, was the speaker of the evening. His interesting talk on "Achievement in Contemporary Design," was illustrated by the use of slides.

### Cincinnati Chapter.

The February meeting of the Cincinnati Chapter was held at the Cincinnati Club, February 14.

H. E. Hewitt, Director of the Great Lakes Division, addressed the Chapter on the economy program of the Institute, the unification of the building industry, and the Small House Service Bureau.

Following Mr. Hewitt's talk a general discussion of the above-mentioned subjects ensued. The opinion of the Chapter regarding the Small House Service Bureau seemed to be favorable, but with the provision that the A. I. A. should have control of the distribution of the plans (plans to be distributed through A. I. A. members).

#### Columbus Chapter.

Interest in the Institute has been very high during the past six months if the attendance at Columbus Chapter monthly meetings is any measure of it.

At the February meeting, Mr. Karl Bolander, former Director of the Columbus Art Gallery, now special lecturer for Century of Progress, gave a preview of the Chicago Fair, illustrated by richly colored slides of the work as projected and as completed to date.

The Chapter has also had a passing interest in the Small House Competition held by the Battelle Memorial Institute (Metallurgical Research) sponsored by the Copper & Brass Research Association. This competition, conducted in January, was approved by the appropriate Chapter committee and was open only to residents of Franklin County, Ohio, and students of Ohio State University. The twenty-six submissions were viewed at the February meeting of the Chapter. The first, second and one third prize were won by Pettit & Oman, and two third prizes by Paul D. Morrill and Lloyd Morgan Yost. The jury was composed of Dr. H. Foster Bain of the Copper & Brass Association, John W. Thomas of the Cleveland Chapter and George Marshall Martin of the Cincinnati Chapter. Howard Dwight Smith of the Columbus Chapter was professional adviser.

A series of six radio talks by Institute members of the faculty of the Department of Architecture of Ohio State University was included in the February and March programs of Station WEAO, at the University. The individual subjects were "The House We Live In," by Charles St. John Chubb; "Historical Considerations," Wilbert C. Ronan; "Maintenance & Rehabilitation," Richard S. Buck; "Home Financing," Galen F. Oman; "The House of Tomorrow," Howard Dwight Smith, and "The Conclusion of the Whole Matter," Mr. Chubb.

The Columbus Chapter, as such, has not organized any so-called depression relief. Local interest has been directed to the recent move by Messrs. Pettit & Oman who have capitalized the current flare for the jig-saw puzzle by organizing a group of architectural draftsmen into a fabricating unit for special de-luxe editions of puzzles made to order. The project, comparable, in a way, to the Delano & Aldrich architectural model making activities begun last year, this

jig-saw movement has kept an otherwise unemployed group busy from ten to sixteen hours a day. Every little bit helps.

#### Connecticut Chapter.

The Round Table discussion of the February meeting of the Connecticut Chapter was opened by Douglas William Orr, who discussed "Unification of the Architectural Profession." He suggested that, if the registration bill passes, architects would be in a strategic position to take the initiative toward the formation of a state-wide body—membership in which would be automatically conferred upon those who become registered architects. This scheme has proven most effective in other states, notably in California. It was pointed out that the prestige of such a representative body would be of the greatest assistance in bettering the standing of all architects, even though we have a peculiarly difficult problem in Connecticut. It was voted that the President appoint a committee on Unification to report back to the April meeting with a definite scheme of procedure.

#### Dayton Chapter.

Herbert E. Hewitt, Regional Director of the Great Lakes Division, visited the Chapter at its February meeting and discussed dues, maintenance of membership, reduction of Institute expenses, unification policies, and the Small House Service Bureau.

Louis Lott suggested a committee to deal with the local banks and building and loan associations in cooperation with the Builder's Exchange for the purpose of controlling the building operations of these institutions.

#### Delaware Chapter.

The Delaware Chapter, the youngest in the Institute, deserves commendation, as evidenced by the report transmitted to The Octagon by Roscoe Cook Tindall, Secretary of the Chapter.

The average attendance at Chapter meetings during the year was seventy-nine per cent of the total membership; the membership was increased fifty per cent during that part of the year yet remaining after the issue of the Charter.

The Chapter has taken an active part in matters pertaining to the registration act for the practice of architecture in Delaware, Housing Commission of the State, dignified publicity for the profession, local architects for local work, and other matters of professional and civic interest.

#### Eastern Ohio Chapter.

Of particular interest at the February meeting of the Eastern Ohio Chapter was the discussion of the feasibility of sponsoring an Architectural exhibition of recent works of the members of this

Chapter. The consensus of opinion being that such an exhibition would be beneficial to the Chapter as a whole, and would enlighten the public as to what Architects really were and the part they played in any building program.

Secretary Kissinger was instructed to send a communication to the City administration of Youngstown, Ohio, asking that the City Planning Commission be advised to rigidly enforce the original city planning and zoning ordinances.

This Chapter has experienced considerable difficulty in getting the city administration to recognize the fact that Architectural representation of the City Planning Commission is imperative if the Planning Commission is to function in accordance with the true intent and purpose of the creation of such a body.

Prior to the meeting, all Chapter members were the guests of the Republic Steel Corporation at its Central Alloy plant in Massillon, Ohio, where they witnessed the manufacture of "Enduro" stainless steel.

#### Georgia Chapter.

At a recent meeting of the Georgia Chapter, Preston S. Stevens presented a letter in which he suggested organizing all the allied building professions and trades in view of promoting legislation along the following lines: All improvements of real estate made within one year to be non-taxable for five or ten years. This would allow the original land tax, but for buildings and improvements on the land there would be no tax during this five or ten year period.

After discussion President Bush-Brown appointed a committee to study the matter and report to the Chapter.

Hal F. Hentz reported that he was acting as temporary chairman on a committee for trade recovery and that his committee is supporting state legislation for the purpose of amending the state laws so that municipalities may borrow R. F. C. money for appropriate improvements.

R. S. Pringle reported that the Committee of which he is Chairman, had brought before the Chamber of Commerce, the recently adopted Philadelphia plan for the promotion of organized rehabilitation of old buildings in Atlanta.

He stated that the executive committee of the Chamber had endorsed the plan enthusiastically and, with information already in their hands furnished by the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, hoped to have a complete organization actually functioning within a week.

#### Hawaii Chapter.

Members of the Hawaii Chapter, with the cooperation of the engineers, are working energetically for the improvement of their Building Code. The following is quoted from the "Weekly

Bulletin" of the Engineering Association of Hawaii:

"An important item of business at last week's meeting (March 17) was the report of C. W. Dickey, Chairman of the Building Ordinance Committee in which he submitted a list of some sixteen proposed changes to the Building Code. His report was given unanimous approval. The changes had already been approved by the City Planning Commission, and will now be presented to the Board of Supervisors. The Committee, which is now a joint affair, consisting of Mr. Dickey and Professor John Mason Young from the Engineer's Association and Messrs. Hart Wood, Herbert C. Cayton and Raymond Morris from the Hawaii Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, has been functioning since June, 1930."

#### Kentucky Chapter.

Mr. L. A. McLean, President of the Southern Trust Company, the speaker for the March meeting of the Kentucky Chapter, was unable to be present. He had, however, sent a letter. This letter outlined at length the importance of closer relations and cooperation between the architects and the building and loan companies, trust companies and others supplying funds, secured by mortgages for building purposes.

President Grimes stated that the principal matter for consideration at this meeting was the proposal to conduct an exhibit, dealing with modernization, to be held next month at the Architects and Builders Exhibit.

The members present expressed their approval of the proposal and their willingness to cooperate.

#### Minnesota Chapter.

At the February meeting of the Minnesota Chapter, C. Grant LaFarge, of the New York Chapter, gave personal reminiscences of his start in the architectural profession in Minneapolis, with Mr. Buffington, fifty years ago.

It was suggested that a case should be built up covering governmental work done by private architects where such work had been done at a loss due to red tape in government procedure.

By resolution, a special committee was authorized to be appointed to make a study of the State Housing Law and report its findings to the Mayor's Housing Commission.

The meeting was concluded by some very fine motion pictures of European travels, by Mr. Melcher.

#### New Jersey Chapter.

At the February meeting of the New Jersey Chapter, President Williams reported as to proposed legislation which would consolidate all state professional boards. He stated that he had

attended a meeting of representatives of the Boards at Trenton which was called to arrange for resistance to the proposed scheme.

It was suggested that members communicate with their Assemblymen urging the passage of the Bill (Assembly Bill No. 90) to enable architects and engineers to enjoy the benefits of a lien law.

President Williams read a letter from the General Electric Company asking cooperation in connection with the small house competition. The President was requested to write to the General Electric Company declining assistance on the ground that while the Chapter believed the competition to be primarily an advertising scheme, it would tend to lend impetus to the stock plan idea.

#### Northern California Chapter.

John Blakewell, Jr., at the February meeting, reported for the Unemployment Committee and presented a program of ways and means to afford relief to needy draftsmen.

Albert John Evers of the Bridge Consultants Committee, reported progress to date in connection with the effort to have competent architectural consultants engaged for the San Francisco Bay Bridge.

President John J. Donovan introduced Mr. Hall of John Roebling's Sons Company, who gave a talk on suspension bridges and showed motion pictures of the Washington Memorial Bridge. The pictures illustrated the construction in progress and were exceptionally interesting in showing the tremendous processes involved in the erection of the bridge.

#### Philadelphia Chapter.

At the March meeting of the Executive Committee of the Philadelphia Chapter, the Secretary reported as to the cooperation which the Chapter had given in carrying out the program of the National Committee for Trade Recovery. The Secretary stated that letters had been written to the twelve Representatives in regard to the proposed amendments to the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932 as recommended by the Trade Recovery Committee.

A report was received from Paul A. Davis, III, in connection with his work on the "Renovize Campaign." The report stated that sixteen cases where architects' services seemed advisable had been turned over to as many architects.

Victor Darwin Abel called to the attention of the Committee the fact that Mayor Moore had appointed a new committee (Directors Sinkler, Caven and Hagedorn) to make recommendations on Zoning, and that this committee had recommended the adoption of the Commission's report of December, 1931.

A motion was adopted authorizing the President and Secretary to advise the Chairman of the Zoning Commission that the Chapter approved the Zoning report and that the President would appoint a committee of three to attend the public hearings on April 5th.

#### Pittsburgh Chapter.

At the February meeting of the Pittsburgh Chapter, President Dowler commended the activity of the Unemployment Relief Committee and, in the absence of Mr. Trimble, gave a resume of the recent work of this Committee in connection with the very successful model house competition and the proposed future program of benefit social gatherings in the Club.

Mr. Dowler introduced Raymond M. Marlier, Chairman of the Current Works Committee, who started the discussion on the topic of the evening, "Cooperative Offices for Architectural Practice." Much interest was aroused and the discussion revealed the fact that there was a general sentiment in favor of cooperative offices particularly during these difficult times.

At the March meeting Mr. Trimble reported on the Unemployment Relief Committee activity. He said that after the success of the House Model Competition the committee was encouraged to sponsor another competition which will soon be announced.

Alfred D. Reid reported that the Architectural Club Relief Committee had planned a series of entertainments for social organizations. The first two had been definitely arranged for the Junior League. Members of the Club were to be paid a nominal rate for entertainment, preparation of club room, check room service, decorating, table service, etc. Other organizations to follow are the Twentieth Century Club, League of Jewish Women, and the College Club. The final event is to be by the Architectural Club and Pittsburgh Chapter combined. A competition with prizes totalling \$125.00 is now being held for a program cover.

#### Rhode Island Chapter.

The regular monthly meeting of the Rhode Island Chapter was held in Providence, at the home of the President, Albert Harkness.

George H. Gray, of New Haven, Regional Director for the New England Division, was present as the guest of the Chapter.

One of the committee reports to which the Chapter gave much attention was that submitted by the Committee on Registration Law. Gorham Henshaw reported for the Committee and gave a resume of the proposed statute. The draft of the proposed law and the question of bringing it before the Assembly was referred by

resolution to the Executive Committee, with power to act.

Director Gray in his talk to the Chapter gave a very interesting, instructive, and practical account of the registration law proposed for Connecticut and of the methods which should be used to present it to the Legislature.

At the March meeting the Committee on Registration Law reported that a bill had been presented to the State Legislature and it was suggested that the members support the proposed legislation in order to secure its enactment.

It was voted that a list of historic houses, to be prepared by N. M. Isham, be adopted as the official list of the Chapter.

President Harkness introduced Colonel H. Anthony Dyer, who gave an interesting talk on the farm houses of Italy and Normandy, illustrated by his own beautiful water colors.

#### St. Louis Chapter.

The February meeting of the St. Louis Chapter, held at Givens Hall, Washington University, was attended by one hundred and twenty-five persons, which in addition to the Chapter's own members included members of the following organizations invited to meet with the Chapter: St. Louis Architectural Club; Students and Faculty in the Department of Architecture, Washington University; Engineers Club of St. Louis; St. Louis Building Congress; Master Builders Association of St. Louis; Producers' Council Club of St. Louis; City Plan Commission; and Officers of General Council on Civic Needs.

E. J. Russell, President of the Institute was the speaker of the evening. He spoke of his recent visit to a number of Chapters, and the efforts of the Institute to get the Government to employ private architects and to make this a permanent governmental policy instead of a temporary one.

President Russell urged a program of reconditioning and "renovizing" similar to the one successful in Philadelphia. He suggested that the younger architects pay more attention to small houses, since 50% of building is of that type.

#### Washington, D. C., Chapter.

At the February meeting of the Washington, D. C., Chapter, approximately thirty members and visitors were present, including Ernest John Russell, Robert D. Kohn, and W. Oscar Mullgardt, newly elected President of the St. Louis Chapter.

Mr. Russell spoke briefly on Institute affairs;

Mr. Kohn told of the progress made with reference to amendments to the Emergency Relief Bill; and Mr. Mullgardt made a few remarks on Chapter affairs.

Excellent progress was reported by Arthur B. Heaton on the proposed remodeling and modernizing program for Washington. A site for the dilapidated house, which it is proposed to remodel, has been obtained and the cooperation of various local organizations has been assured.

The Committee on Education reported that the recent exhibition of architectural work for schools and colleges in Washington was unusually successful. A series of talks on architecture is being arranged for the local schools.

#### Washington State Chapter.

G. W. Stoddard, Chairman of the Exhibition Committee, at the February meeting, spoke of the proposed exhibition of small houses to be held at the Bon Marche, Seattle, and asked the cooperation of all members in collecting for this Exhibit, sketches, with cost of houses between \$5,000 and \$15,000.

President Holmes reported a movement sponsored by three members of the Construction League of the United States, to introduce in the State Legislatures bills inaugurating building programs for public works for six years ahead, a local organization having been effected for this purpose, headed by Mr. Joseph Jacobs of the Seattle section of the American Society of Civil Engineers. After some discussion in which was brought out the idea that legislators should be shown the greater amount of employment per dollar in the construction of buildings than in other forms of construction, it was voted that the Chapter approve the movement and that the President be authorized to further legislation of this kind with the assistance of a Committee to be appointed by him which would devise means of gathering statistics showing the greater employment value of building construction.

#### West Texas Chapter.

The architects of Texas have again presented to the Legislature of that state a bill requiring the licensing of architects. Such a bill was before the previous Legislature, or its appropriate committee, but was not enacted into law.

The members of the West Texas Chapter who attended the recent Committee Hearing in Austin on the Architects' License Bill reported at the February meeting, that the Bill had received a unanimous favorable report by the Committee.

## Planning and Building the City of Washington

As a contribution to the George Washington Bicentennial, the Washington Society of Engineers, with the cooperation of the Washington Chapter of The American Institute of Architects, has produced a work containing valuable technical material prepared by recognized authorities. The material is so presented that it is applicable not merely to the Federal city but to the problems of architects, landscape architects, engineers, and municipal officials generally. It was edited by Dr. Frederick Haynes Newell, former President of the Washington Society of Engineers.

Better than any description is the list of sections and the names of the collaborating writers:

*The George Washington Canal*, by Lawrence W. Wallace, Executive Secretary, American Engineering Council.

*The Founding of the City*, by the late William Tindall, Bureau of Information, the District Government.

*Highways and the Highway Plan*, by Captain H. C. Whitehurst, Highway Engineer for the District of Columbia.

*Federal Buildings and the Triangle Plan*, by Alexander B. Trowbridge, Fellow of The American Institute of Architects.

*Municipal Buildings*, by Francis B. Sullivan, President, Washington, D. C., Chapter, A. I. A.

*Parks and Monuments*, by Col. U. S. Grant, 3rd, Director Public Parks and Buildings for the District of Columbia.

*Bridges*, by Frank B. Scheetz, Interstate Commerce Commission.

*Water Supply System*, by Major J. D. Arthur, U. S. Engineer in Charge.

*Sewage System*, by Major J. B. Gordon, Sanitary Engineer.

*Cleaning of the City of Washington*, by Morris Hacker, Supervisor of Disposal of City Refuse.

*Railway Terminals and Transportation*, by Charles Henry Spencer, Bureau of Valuation, Interstate Commerce Commission.

*Public Utilities and Air Ports*, by Gen. Mason M. Patrick, Chairman, Public Utilities Commission.

*Suburbs and Suburban Development*, by Charles W. Eliot, 2d, National Park and Planning Commission.

*Federal Engineering Activities*, by Walter I. Swanton, Engineer and Author.

*Public and Private Scientific Institutions*, by Watson Davis, Editor, Science News, National Research Council.

*Residential Advantages*, by Miss Harlean James, Executive Secretary, American Civic Association.

Appendices as follows: Engineering Libraries—Map Collections—Standards—Bibliography.

This publication is recommended to the members of the Institute by the Committee on the National Capital. The regular edition, \$2.00; Founder's Memorial Edition De Luxe, with Gold Letter Cover Imprint, \$3.00.

Published by Ransdell Incorporated, 810-16 Rhode Island Avenue, N. E., Washington, D. C.

## Members Elected in March 1933

<i>Alabama Chapter</i> .....	RAYMOND CARL SIZEMORE
<i>Brooklyn Chapter</i> .....	GEORGE W. TROFAST-GILLETTE
<i>Cleveland Chapter</i> .....	GEORGE B. COOMBE
<i>Connecticut Chapter</i> .....	HERBERT GIBSON
<i>New York Chapter</i> .....	GEORGE F. DEZELLER
<i>Rhode Island Chapter</i> .....	J. PETER GEDDES, II
<i>St. Louis Chapter</i> .....	ERNEST T. FRITON
<i>Scranton-Wilkes-Barre Chapter</i> .....	ARTHUR P. COON, EDWARD J. RUTLEDGE
<i>Southern California Chapter</i> .....	LELAND F. FULLER, G. STANLEY WILSON

## BOOKS AND DOCUMENTS

### STANDARD CONTRACT DOCUMENTS

Agreement and General Conditions in cover.....	\$0.50
General Conditions without Agreement.....	.35
Agreement without General Conditions.....	.15
Bond of Suretyship.....	.10
Form of Sub-Contract.....	.10
Letter of Acceptance of Subcontractor's Proposal .....	.10
Cover (heavy paper with valuable notes).....	.02
Complete set in cover.....	.75

### MISCELLANEOUS DOCUMENTS

Agenda for Architects.....	\$ .40
Review of the Standard Documents.....	1.00
Standard Filing System.....	.50
Alphabetical Index to Standard Filing System.....	.50
Standard Filing System and Alphabetical Index (combined) .....	1.00

### BOOKS

HANDBOOK OF ARCHITECTURAL PRACTICE.....	\$5.00
THE AUTOGRAPHY OF AN IDEA— <i>Louis H. Sullivan</i> .....	3.00
A SYSTEM OF ARCHITECTURAL ORNAMENT— <i>Louis H. Sullivan</i> .....	15.00
CHARLESTON, S. C. (Vol. I—Octagon Library of Early American Architecture).....	20.00
BERTRAM GROSVENOR GOODHUE—ARCHITECT AND MASTER OF MANY ARTS.....	30.00

---

These books and documents are published and endorsed by The American Institute of Architects. They are highly commended to the membership.

A discount of twenty-five per cent is given to members of the Institute, on the Handbook, and on the Standard Contract Documents in lots of 100 or more, when ordered direct from THE OCTAGON.

Transportation prepaid on order amounting to \$1.00 or more net. Orders, communications and remittances (checks, money-orders, cash or stamps) should be sent to The American Institute of Architects, The Octagon, 1741 N. Y. Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C.

---

