

man into my office with the idea that I would teach him architecture. What could I do? Nothing! And none of my co-ferees would do any better than I could myself. I have often advised young men who wished to acquire a knowledge of architecture to go to the United States and obtain an education there, because they could not obtain one in Canada. I have advised young men to go to Boston and other cities in the United States, to receive an education which they could not get in Montreal. It should be one of the early objects of the Association to establish some means of founding a college or providing other ways of giving young men a systematic training in architecture, and until that is done, our profession will never be what it should be. It is true we have a College of Technology in Montreal, but I do not think architecture forms any part of the subjects taught there. It might be made part of the course, and now that our McGill College here has, through the munificence of some of our citizens of Montreal, been so largely endowed in the Science Department, and where there are so many subjects that would be common between architecture and engineering, I hope the time is not far distant when we shall have a Chair of Architecture or lectures on architecture in connection with the Science and Art Departments. (Cheers.) Independent of the other benefits to flow from the formation of an Association such as this, I look upon that as being one of the most important—the establishment of some means whereby our young men can obtain a proper education in architecture, and I shall do my best, Mr. President, to carry out this object when it comes before us.

Mr. Brown: Mr. President and gentlemen,—In the outset I may as well say that I have nothing to add to the admirable remarks of these Societies, but I have a few words of advice to give them. First of all, I am only too pleased to see you gentlemen gathered together here around one table. I never expected to see so many sit at the same table, joining in one idea and embracing each other's thoughts. The great trouble with the profession in Montreal—I am sorry to say in Canada—is animosity and jealousy. I, as one of the senior members of this profession, have nothing to say about it. I have been tempered with, but I thought at it. These young members of this Association have a lot to learn. They have to learn this that they have got to join their seniors in carrying out the different works, instead of making fun of their seniors. I am very sorry to say that I have seen a good many members at this Board appear in court, in cases where I have been obliged to sue for payment of my professional services, and swear that my services were worth nothing, but the judge told them that they were quite contrary to their own opinions and the value of my services. I hope that this Association will be the foot-stone to an architectural monument that will be lasting for our time at least. (Applause.) I hope that we will not be content merely to gather together at the table, where the fruits and the grand things of the time to come will be spread before us, but that we will meet together for mutual benefit and instruction, because neither you nor I can do without the other. We all are members of one family, and we must not act as if we were not. We are architects, and I hope, gentlemen of my profession here, that you will look forward to the promotion of a noble cause, that you willarken to the advice of those that surround you, and that you will take many a hint from those that can aid you, and that you will give hints to those who may require them. There is a great deal to be done, and it seems to me there is a field large enough for us all. I hope we will join hands, under one flag, and make a profession of mutual understanding, agree upon one point—that we are architects on one basis and with one thought and one idea, and that is, that we support each other at any time we may be called upon to do so. (Cheers.) I have seen for years past, as Mr. Baillarge has said, the need of a Society like this. I have reluctantly thought that it never could be formed, because as I have said, jealousy is a strong feeling among us all; but I repeat, there is room for us all, and room for five hundred and a thousand more in Canada. If we will for one hand and work together successfully in one cause, the great trouble and dissension among the architects in past days, that has been to vie with each other as to how much more work one would do than the other for nothing, and how much they might do to try and keep others from getting employment. I have opposed from the first and I still oppose—I might as well tell the members of the Association who are present—enter into any competition with each other. Professional brother is paid for his ideas. (Applause.) I for one am willing to sign a document, adhering to my views, that I will enter into no competition unless those that enter into it with me are paid the same as I am paid, and then that a professional brother will be selected as an expert to decide which is the best design. (Applause.) In doing this, it is not because I expect I will be the successful competitor, but because I am willing to bow with due deference to the decision of one that this Association will appoint, and it is with the idea of giving the public of Montreal to understand that the architects of this province have brains which they are not willing to have doled out as though they were so many scavengers expecting work. I received a notice the other day to enter into a competition, and they calmly told us that they had selected the leading architects of Montreal. I think they should have started with a competition for the purpose of getting rid of the trouble, and would appoint a leading architect to decide as to which design was best. I do not think that they should select some one who, if presented with a sketch of a dog and a little child on a footpath, for instance, will turn it upside down and adopt that design. I for one want to enter into the competition with my brethren on fair terms. There is to be a competition shortly in Montreal and I was waited upon and asked to enter into it. I said, "I am willing to enter into competition on one condition, and that is, that the design which may be adopted shall not exceed ten per cent. on the estimates." They said, "would it not be better for the architect to carry out the design for the man employing him?" I said, "No, the man of genius who is competent to prepare such a design, is not a contractor." They should not be under the thumb of the general public. I wish this Association to understand that if any man wishes to lead the profession, please let him charge with the responsibility, and hold to each other and let them know that we have a claim for our ideas and for what we have to go through—for the experience that we have dearly bought. All that a young man has to do now-a-days to become an architect is to enter an architect's office and then after three or four months experience he hangs up his shingle and professes to be an architect. I, as one of the profession, protest against it. If any man wishes to lead, let him enter this Association should have studied in an architect's office for at least five years. (Cheers.) and even five years, I may as well say, is a very short term. Although I am a comparatively young man, I have been over thirty years practicing in Montreal, and I know that I have a lot to learn about the business yet, but the young men think they have nothing to learn and on such a basis they are bound to be glad to have an instructor published at once, and a class of instructors in the Hutchison suggests, and that each one of us should take his term—say a fortnight or a week—and train these young men who have talents, and who show some capacity

for the business and let them understand how much they have to learn, instead of letting them go away with the idea that they know as much as they think they do. The longer we live, the more conscious we become of the extent of our own ignorance. As architects, I may say that there are several clauses in our law which are immensely injurious to us. One is that a contractor and an architect are placed on the same basis, in reference to anything that may happen during the construction of a work. Some contemptible proprietor who expects to put up a building for nothing, employs an architect of some standing; he will not give him sufficient means to carry out his design, and being a young man, the architect naturally dislikes the idea of losing the work. Nevertheless, he is held responsible for the work for ten years. The law should be repealed at once, and I think that this Association will have sufficient influence to have that law removed or amended. (Cheers.) In reference to strength, I consider that unity is required, and I agree with Mr. Roy when he says that not only the architects of Canada, but the profession throughout America should go hand in hand—should unite as one man and let the world know that we are not divided—that we are not the "spalpeens" that we are supposed to be. Let us show them that the architects are an educated class. I contend that no architect can be fitted for his profession unless he is educated, because wherever art is appreciated, education must come in first. We know perfectly well that it takes a lifetime of study to make an architect, and when a man becomes an architect, his services should be appreciated. Instead of being a contractor, and taking a position as we have never yet held in this country, I am glad to see my Quebec brethren here, and to know that they are joining with the profession in Montreal, heart and hand, and uniting for the purpose of advancing the interests of the profession. This is the first gathering of this kind that we have had, and I hope the longer we live the more thoroughly will we realize that this Association is doing good, not only to its members, but to the profession at large throughout Canada. (Cheers.)

Mr. Doran: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen.—Rising after so many of my seniors, I feel at a loss to know what to say, but I must begin by stating that I heartily endorse everything that my co-ferees have said—firstly, that we have commenced upon a solid foundation; that being assured, I think we need have no fear of the ten years law as regards the stability of our institution. (Cheers.) I think none of us will be afraid to guarantee its stability, provided we go on in the same spirit in which we have commenced—provided we carry up the structure of our institution, cemented by brotherly union and sustained by the proper professional spirit. I think we will recognize that there is a field for us all, that we are engaged in the same noble task, and all take our inspiration from the great architect of the Universe—that profiting by the world's hostility in the past, we are prepared to go forward. It is necessary also that we should provide for the education of our younger brethren, of those anxious to join the profession, in order that they should be able to stand as members of the profession. I say that it is unnecessary to go further. A great object has been attained merely in the formation of this Association, merely in the drive through the streets to-day, small as it may appear to be. It has excited a certain amount of wonder and comment. The question will be asked "who are these?" I hope the words will be "who are the gentlemen that compose that distinguished body of men?" (Laughter.) The answer will be, it is the architects of Montreal, and the members of the Association, and the Association. The public has a great deal to learn as to what constitutes an architect. In a young country like this, where there are no dilettantes in the art, and the public do not understand that architecture is an art and profession at the same time—do not understand that it requires a rare combination of the artist and business man. The artist is responsible not only for the artistic and the scientific character of his work, but he has also to be a man of business, to understand the ways and means of things and the necessities of those for whom he has to think—that he has to be, as it were, a Father Confessor to the world at large. The trouble is that people do not as a rule understand what an architect's duties are. I have had clients of mine come in and haggle about fees, and after they saw the amount of work and responsibility thrown upon them they have said, "I did not know you had as much trouble as that; I had no idea that you had so much work to do as an architect." When the public understand that they have to do so much, and that your work was then done, and I was under the impression that you were an exorbitant fellow to charge me \$100 for a thing like that. I had no idea of the responsibility there is on an architect. It is necessary that we should educate the public as to what an architect really is, and then there will be no trouble in establishing a tariff. The tariff will come by the good sense of our patrons, who will understand that it is better to pay a fair compensation and get full value for their money. Let them understand that the architect is not paid merely for his plans. Some of our clients often want to claim the plans when the work is done; they say "I paid for that plan and it is mine." Let such a man understand that he is not paying for a plan, but that he is paying the architect for knowing how to make one. They are merely paying the man who knows how, paying him for the plan. When the public understand that they have to do so much, and that only architecture but to become proficient in any profession, and every true architect is learning all the time. When the Association is properly formed as it has been to-day commenced—when it comes to be in a chaotic condition, the public will understand what the profession of an architect is. They will learn that it is not merely necessary for a man to know how to draw a plan—because many a school boy can do that—that does not constitute an architect. When the public know that it takes a lifetime to do the work, they will then be satisfied, as I say, to pay a man, not only for what he does—which is merely his tools to show what he has conceived in his brain—but to pay him for knowing how, and to reward him for the lifetime of study he has devoted to his profession. This I think our Association will in a great measure succeed in doing, and the other we meet the better we will become recognized. The more impression we make in private conversation and in the public mind, the more importance of our work, the better our standing will be. Even in our fair city of Montreal the idea prevails that all that is necessary to be done to put up a building is to set a lawyer at work. The lawyers will have to recognize that there is a part of jurisprudence belonging to our profession as much as medical jurisprudence belongs to the medical profession. Until we respect ourselves we cannot expect the public to do so. Our duty is to show the public that we are not what they think we are. I am sorry that he did not make the same statement in his remarks just now—when asked about his nationality, that he was half American and half Irish, and that he had the American capacity for blowing. (Laughter.) We must all learn that, and we need not go to our neighbors to the south for it. When we establish this College of Architecture, I propose that Mr. Brown shall give the lectures to-day in private conversation he has had sufficient to let the public understand what constitutes an architect; the profession will cease to be deserving of the remark that was formerly made about school teaching in England. In the old country it became a proverb