

therefore varied the "setting out" by first (in Clause 1 of the "Scale") setting forth the full services and the charges therefor, while in Clause 2 [items of (a) and (b)] shows the charges for partial services. It will be seen that (a) provides for preliminary studies (formerly and—it is submitted—erroneously termed "sketches") to be charged for at $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and (b) up to but exclusive of "supervision," 4 per cent. This charge is but a fair and reasonable remuneration for the work detailed, and includes the $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. for copies and details formerly charged to the builder. This leaves $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. for supervision as before, but by not mentioning it separately the client is not "invited" (so to speak) to do away with it. Thus Clause 2 stops at a stage where the otherwise complete service would—in normal cases—become complete, i.e., by the supervision of the work.

In Clause 10 of the old scale an increased fee was allowable for works costing less than £300. This, for a long time past, has been recognised as far too low a figure. The new R.I.B.A. scale for this class of work is a sliding one, varying from 10 per cent. on less than £100 to 6 per cent. on £2,000. The Committee has very carefully considered this method, and, while believing the principle to be thoroughly sound, has varied the maximum and minimum to £1,000 and £300 respectively, thinking these limits to be more suitable to conditions in this country. On the figures as now suggested the "slide" will operate in this way:

Not exceeding £300	10 %
" " £400	$9\frac{1}{2}$ %
" " £500	9 %
" " £600	$8\frac{1}{2}$ %
" " £700	8 %
" " £800	$7\frac{1}{2}$ %
" " £900	7 %
And £1,000 and over	$6\frac{1}{2}$ %

Very careful consideration was given to the "Housing," "Quantities," and "Valuations" section of the R.I.B.A. Scale in view of possible developments here. It must be noted, however, that though a scale is published by the R.I.B.A. there is a footnote in their Kalendar stating that this section is still under revision. The Committee therefore thought it wise merely to state that

"this Institute adopts, in general terms, the scale laid down by the R.I.B.A., allowing for such variations as are necessary to meet local conditions."

This leaves us the right to adopt the R.I.B.A. Scale as and when it may be finally settled, without the necessity for calling our own members together to confirm every revision of the R.I.B.A. Scale, for it must be remembered that any further alterations made to this draft scale of ours, once it is approved, can only be made by a general meeting of all members, specially convened for the purpose, as laid down by the Regulations.

It is hoped that these notes will reach members in time for the special meetings to be called to consider the draft, and that they will prove helpful in coming to a decision.

Are Architects Themselves Voluntarily Lowering the Public Appraisal of the Value of Architectural Services?

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir,—I find that the authorities of the New Zealand Institute of Architects are at last amending the Scale of Charges. I trust that in doing so they will make sure that their fellow-members will receive a fair remuneration for their services. But when all is said and done it is not altogether the fault of the public that it has a rather low appraisal of the value of architectural services. I suggest that the fault lies with the profession, or, rather, those members thereof who so gladly take part in competitions—even for works of small importance and cost. Can we expect the public to place anything but a low value upon our services while we are so ready to take part in an unseemly scramble for the *chance of employment*, and put up with any sort of incompetence and unfairness or indignity on the part of the promoters while doing so?

An American architect, Mr. Chas. D. Maginnis, a member of the distinguished firm of Maginnis and Walsh, writing recently with reference to a discussion upon professional matters which he had had with a dentist, said:—

"It is no part of the materialistic programme, I observe, to remove real professional disability. I refer to the demoralising practice of competition, which, whatever may be said for it as a method of selecting an architect in the case of public work, has wrought incalculable harm to the profession. Is it not absolutely certain that the main, if not the whole, difficulty in gaining public acceptance for a reasonable minimum charge for professional services was that *in actual practice we were demonstrating that our minimum charge was really zero?*"

"I neglected to ask, but I should dearly like to know, how dentistry gets along without competition? I venture to say that not even an architect with a toothache would dream of making a condition of his patronage that half-a-dozen dentists gratuitously exhibit their skill for him."

"We have not, I fear, brought up our clients the right way. And the young men? When I speak my mind to brother architects about competitions, I usually encounter the idea of the young man. Where, in heaven's name, do the young doctors and the young lawyers come from? Two dentists on our office floor are mere youths. And there are young architects in the same building—I have seen them and have been one myself. There would be no fewer of them if competitions were abolished forever."

I have tried to see something more in the institution than the erroneous principle (which we have fixed so definitely in the public mind to our disadvantage) that in order to develop five ideas you must have five architects. We are more resourceful