

safe load to impose on ordinary clay soil, said: "A frame one or two storey house, or load up to 87 tons." Such answers he believed to be due, as already stated, to lack of proper consideration of the questions. These features of the examinations would doubtless in time disappear. At first it was thought the examinations might be concluded within two days, but it was found necessary to double the period. Even four days was much too short a time. It was not right that students should be compelled to write on an examination for three or four consecutive days. There should be time allowed for rest and study. Two weeks would not be too long a period. The examinations had revealed the fact that students who were supposed to be well up in certain subjects, in reality knew very little about them. The O. A. A. should feel grateful to the students who had come forward to assist it in carrying out its objects. The speaker pointed to the fact that an Act was in a fair way to be passed by the New York Legislature under which no man would be able to call himself an architect without having obtained a license to practice in the State. At the next session of the Legislature the O. A. A. should endeavor to have the word "Registered" struck out of the Architects' Act, and by so doing secure a guarantee to the public that persons practicing architecture were competent to do so. The speaker concluded by expressing the hope that the members of the Architectural Sketch Club might be better able than the architects of the present day to do meritorious work.

In response to the toast "Canadian Architecture," Mr. Langton spoke as follows:

People who live in the older countries have inherited the results of the labor of many generations. They live as it were in a completed edifice and enjoy all its comfort and beauty, and, though in some respects life is therefore so much the less worth living, it cannot be denied that there is great pleasure and privilege in being posterity.

We, on the contrary, are ancestors. We are the early Canadians hard at work upon the foundations. We are not cribbed and caged and confined like our kin beyond the sea, but, on the other hand the glories of our buildings are all in the future. Canadian architecture is rather a subject for speculation than criticism; we may say that Canadian architecture as an established fact as yet does not exist.

There has been much said during the last half century in England about the formation of a modern style. More recently in the United States there has been talk about an American style. It was hoped that the late H. H. Richardson had created a style that would become national. It may be true what was said by an English reviewer, that since the architect of the Palace of Diocletian generated Romanesque architecture by taking the column of the Roman order and inserting it under the arch, no one man has done so much to develop a style of architecture as Mr. Richardson. Yet I think it has proved to be a mistake to found on his work the hope of an American style. The school of imitators are one by one turning their attention in another direction. The mark that Mr. Richardson has left upon American architecture is something much wider and deeper than the mere appropriation of the peculiar characteristics of one particular period of architecture. He taught us how to make use of the examples left us from former times by cutting from them the spirit of the workman and doing our own work in the same spirit. He did no copying. What he took from an old example was not only adapted but usually improved. In the case of the most salient example of his reproduction of a model—that of the tower of Trinity church—I think we may fairly say that we should have heard very little of Salamanca Cathedral if the tower of Trinity Church had not been built to put honor upon the tower of Salamanca as the original.

I think then we may agree that the Richardsonian Romanesque revival had as much vitality in it as it is possible for a style revival ever to have. Not only was the style adopted made to live in our century but there seemed to be something in the theoretical view taken by approving critics that, inasmuch as the style adopted was an undeveloped style, there was the more hope that the natural law of development should have course with it now that it was revived.

However, the course of work in the United States seems to be moving away from it, retaining only the high standard of taste and the right feeling in design which were introduced into the country along with it, and which I think we may hope are part of the inheritance of American architects and of ourselves henceforth. The right spirit is abroad, and though the architectural world seems to be on a living in it to be a wild sea of conflicting determinations and shifting views, I think one who has even a slight acquaintance with history will recognize the condition from which have emerged all those results which have formed steps in the world's advance, from which succeeding generations take their start, and to which they always return for their basis. I think we may almost consider that the word style—though in an old country like England, where tradition has force, and where they are empowered by the excellence of the past, still retains its conventional usage as applied to architecture—may with us on this continent begin to have the deeper and better meaning of character, which includes the other and goes beyond it.

To say that a man or a woman has style, is to give to them the highest expression of admiration for their personal charm. Style is beyond beauty, though it often includes it—always includes it in the highest sense of the term. It is the harmonious

compound of qualities which makes the man or woman who possesses it strike the eye at once, and impress us as distinct. This is what we want in architecture. Not fashion in architectural clothing, but that the building have always distinction of character in accordance with its own programme of requirement, and the conditions of its circumstances. It must be a growth proceeding from the continual effort to satisfy the conditions of our mode of life, our means, our climate, and our material. I doubt if anything can permanently prevent the growth of a true style of architecture, but it may be delayed by temporary fashion quite enough to prevent any of us having the pleasure of seeing it in our lifetime. So I want to enlist your sympathy on the right side. You will be soon starting out for yourselves—some of you this year—and your services are wanted in this matter. It is the work of the many, and with a common idea we can progress fast, helping one another by example, as iron sharpeneth iron. The English House of Commons as a body is said to be always wiser than the wisest man in it, and we have no need to wait for the advent of a genius to create Canadian architecture, if we only have in common the idea of making our architecture true. It ought not to be necessary to say much upon this subject so long after the acceptance by the architectural world that in art only truth is life. But we have only to look about us to see that its application still lags.

We have still amphitheatrical churches with a couple of storeys of society rooms and class rooms, all contained within an exterior which represents as faithfully as it can the mediæval church with its single spacious hall. We are about to have a drill shed here which, inasmuch as it is Government work and the result of tradition rather than individual intention, we need not feel shy of criticizing. It is, of course, to be a castellated structure. In former days arms were kept in a castle. Must, therefore, the building that stores our arms nowadays represent a castle, however feebly? Are we to suppose that when Toronto is surrounded by the beleaguering host, our brave defenders will retire upon the impregnable drill shed and man the battlemented turrets and cornice? We might as well hold that because our grandfathers travelled by means of horses, we should, therefore, build our railway stations to represent as far as possible a stable. I do not want to turn this into a lecture upon truth in architecture, only to take the stand that this only is the course along which our architecture can develop.

There was a little dialogue in this morning's *Mail* which seemed to me to offer a good illustration of the point.

It is as follows:

Artist—"Those evergreens on the north side of your house have a delightful effect."

Farmer—"I should say they had. Ten trees keep off the wind and save about \$8 worth of firewood every winter."

That is the whole thing in the nutshell. The farmer plants a row of trees where they are wanted. The trees have a delightful effect. And the more you perceive the usefulness of the trees, the deeper the effect of poetry which they produce. Art and matter of fact are inseparable.

If architecture is to satisfy, the plan must be convenient, and must be expressed in the composition. The construction must be suitable to the kind of building, to the material, and to the climate. This a brief recipe which, however, means a great deal. And I appeal to you if it is not more manly and more worth the devotion of one's energies than always trying to get away from your own problem in imitation of something entirely different.

It takes thought, of course, but you will have at first, when you begin practice a great deal of what has been called "God-given leisure," in which you can invent at your will. You will find also that you know nothing. It will surprise you to find this. It did me. You will have to learn much then, and will have to teach yourselves: and you may as well learn the right way while you are about it. The problems of architecture are limited after all. You must ultimately be at home with them in one way or another. If you will get into the way of handling them rightly you will be better architects, you will be better men, and you will be happier men. You will not find work wearisome as you grow older, but will find in it an interest that mere money making cannot give. And Canada will have buildings that will give pleasure to those who see them, which foreigners will recognize as Canadian, intimately associated with the life of the country—the Canadian style of buildings.

Mr. W. H. Elliott, responding on behalf of the contractors, said the interests of no two classes could be more identical than those of the architect and contractor. In fact, so close was their relationship, that like cats thrown across a rope, they sometimes got to fighting—about what, the architects only know. (Laughter.) One lack in relationship would be supplied if architects would refuse to allow contractors to work for less than a fair price. If this rule were adopted, a better class of buildings would be the result. Architects sometimes congratulated themselves upon having secured a low price for their work, but he desired to tell them, if unaware of the fact, that it was impossible to beat the contractor. (Laughter.)

Mr. A. H. Gregg claimed that the contraction caused by the recent exams, followed by the sudden expansion on the present occasion, left him in no fit condition to respond to the toast to "The Coming Architects." In no way was the world's progress better illustrated than by the facilities for education which were being placed before the rising generation. There was a general