really an arbitrator, whose duty it is to see that the various agreements are carried out in fairness to both parties and who will not hesitate to tell the owner that he has taken an unfair position if this be true. Therefore, the owner must not expect the architect to exhibit any false loyalty in dealings with the contractor and the sub-contractors.

"It is evident that the owner who fully realises his duties and who strives to develop and maintain the proper spirit of co-operation with the architect has much to gain. It is very difficult for an architect to work enthusiastically if he is forced to worry about the attitude of the owner. It may be readily understood that without enthusiasm an architect cannot do his best work.

"For the period during which the structure is being planned and built the architect is in practically every sense a business partner of the owner. He is working for the same results, and if the owner will but consider his duties as the duties of one associate to another he will not only fully appreciate the work and responsibility of the architect, but he will do much towards expediting the work and guaranteeing his own satisfaction."

Architectural Design.

In the preceding pages while the fact that the architect is artist as well as constructor and man of business has not been lost sight of, yet this fact has not, perhaps, been given the weight it deserves. It is primarily because of this fact—because his aim is the production not of mere building, but of architecture, that the architect, as such, persists.

What is the difference between Architecture and Building? It is very difficult to put into words. A satisfactory definition of architecture is yet to be found. Professor Lethaby wrote somewhere—I quote from memory—that a definition which pleased him for a time was "building touched with emotion." This definition, even if incomplete, at least suggests the difference between architecture and building. Building provides—however efficiently—for the satisfaction of physical needs only; architecture, on the other hand, while providing equally well for the physical needs, satisfies in addition the needs of the spirit. Mr. Clutton Brock, in his illuminating essay, "The Ultimate Belief," says that "we do not understand the importance of the æsthetic activity, because we suppose it to be merely a source of pleasure, whereas it is an activity of the spirit without which the spirit can never be satisfied." That the craving for beauty is a spiritual activity cannot be denied. That beauty in building can evoke the spiritual emotions and minister to the spiritual side of life, many glorious temples and cathedrals have testified through the centuries. But temples and cathedrals no longer form the main building activities of whole peoples. To-day schools, libraries, hospitals, post offices, factories, and other utilitarian or altruistic buildings are taking their place in the common life. To-day rulers raise money not for churches but for workers' homes; not for cathedrals but for power-houses and town halls. All these buildings touch the common life of the people at every point—surely they should be made to minister to their spiritual and not alone to satisfy their physical needs? To do this they must be as beautiful as it is possible to make them. This does not mean that something—some extraneous ornament—must be added to them, although ornament will probably, in some form be there, but beauty must be inherent in the structures themselves. The conception of the plan, the proportioning and the combination of the structural forms, the texture and colour of the materials, must together result in the satisfaction of the æsthetic craving in those beholding the buildings. In other words, they must be examples of architecture and not specimens of mere building. And it is the function of the architect alone—not the engineer or the builder—to create architecture. He will be successful—as in his other functions—in varying measure. First in accordance as he is possessed with ideals and definiteness of aim and has within himself an appreciation of beauty. Secondly in proportion to his opportunities. The power of æsthetic appreciation is in part at least a gift, but a gift capable of training and growth. It must be developed in every properly trained architect to some extent by that study of ancient forms in architecture, sculpture and painting, which is an essential part of his training. The measure of the original gift and the extent of its training and development will be the measure of his success in the field of design, in so far as that success is conditioned only by his own personality and attainments. But unfortunately an architectural designer is limited in many ways—he is partly dependent upon the skill and goodwill of others to execute his design—he is dependent far more than artists in any other field of work upon those who employ his services. A sympathetic appreciation upon the part of the latter of the ideals for which the architect is striving, and of the difficulties in his way, will be an invaluable help. A readiness to make some sacrifice for the attainment of beauty, too, will be an inspiration, for beauty is rarely cheap or easy of attainment. A willingness to be guided by the architect in this, the æsthetic side of the problem, will, as in that of the practical, be wholly to the client's benefit.

The Registered Architect and His Fees.

In 1913 the New Zealand Legislature passed an Act for the Registration of Architects in which certain qualifications for admission to the Institute of Architects at that time and in the future were laid down. This Act was asked for by architects on two principal grounds. It was felt by members of the profession to be only equitable that they should secure that increase of public confidence, that rise in status, which State sanction always gives. This privilege had already been long accorded to other professions. It was felt also to be only fair and right that the regular practitioner, whose professional qualifications were the result of arduous