

the avenues. That was in the grandiose style of that period.

As time passed a greater formality was introduced into the English garden. In the reign of William and Mary, the King brought over Dutch gardeners from Holland, and the style in England then became more and more formal until it reached a degree of childishness. The hedges were clipped, the evergreens were clipped into fantastic shapes and nothing was allowed to be natural. A reaction was bound to set in. It is commonly supposed that the architectural profession had nothing to do with this reaction. That is to say, there is a popular fallacy which even invades the architectural mind that this reaction was brought about by the uneducated gardeners, but the first man to suggest a more natural style of gardening was Sir William Chambers, who spent many years of his early life in China and was a great admirer of the Chinese style of gardening. On his return he wrote a book on the gardens of the East, and was appointed by George III to be the King's architect and superintendent of the Royal Gardens—a rather curious dual position. As Superintendent of Gardens he constructed Kew Gardens, which as you know are entirely in the informal natural style. His own particular impress is left there in the form of a Chinese pagoda with its appropriate setting. As far as architecture was concerned, I think he was responsible for Somerset House. So that it was actually an architect, and one of considerable eminence, who was the father of the change.

It was carried on by another famous man by the name of Kent, who began life as a coach painter, was taken under the patronage of a well-known architect and in due course became an architect himself. I think a great many must know the name of Kent, because it was said of him that he "Leaped the fence and saw all nature to be a garden." He swept away the old formal hedges, fences and walls, he levelled the terraces and brought the turf in great sweeping lawns up to the house walls. His work was carried still further and in a much more extreme form by a man named Brown. He was called "Capability" Brown, because whenever he was called in to give advice he always said the place had no capabilities. A great nobleman asked him to make a report on his place; he came and went, but did nothing, and after some little time he was asked why nothing had been heard from him. His reply was, "Oh, the place has no capabilities. I can do nothing with it."

The next school went to the other extreme from that of formalism; disregarding the building entirely and thought only of imitating nature. In fact, they carried it to a much more childish extreme than the formalist had done with his clipped yews and peacock evergreens and the like; for the new style of gardening

very often included such things as ready-made imitations of nature, such as a dead tree set up in a park by way of making it look natural.

The next great name among gardeners is that of Humphrey Repton, who, unlike "Capability" Brown, was a man of considerable culture. Brown began as a kitchen gardener, quite ignorant, but rose to a great height in his profession and became a very rich man. Repton, as I say, a man of culture; he was much more moderate, much more restrained in his views than his predecessors of that particular school, but he was of the landscape school. There is not the slightest doubt that the landscape style of gardening which is in existence in the United States to-day, was the direct outcome of the influence of Humphrey Repton.

Now, in considering formal style, which is sometimes looked upon as the highest form of garden design, we must go back a few centuries—say the 17th, or early 18th century. In looking at any of the old chateaus we will find that not only the garden itself, that is to say, the garden immediately surrounding the house, was an extremely formal one, but what was known as the greater layout, or what we would now call the park, being a portion which was beyond the garden proper, was also formal. It appeared as long single or double avenues of trees, running for miles sometimes in straight lines, out into the country, and between them were open grazing areas for deer or cattle. They were very formal. Now the landscape school has given us the natural park that we have to-day; the trees arranged with such skill as to appear like the trees of wild or natural scenery.

Now, while I am sure that almost anyone will admit that the ground immediately surrounding the house should conform to the lines of the house, there is a limit beyond which we should not go with formality. Immediately we get away from the immediate vicinity of the house, we can allow ourselves a little more latitude and adopt a more natural style which will gradually bring the surrounding country into harmony with the garden proper and the house.

Sometimes people say to me, "Can we have a Canadian style of garden?" It is the same thing as saying, "Can we have a Canadian style of architecture?" Since gardening has always been historically associated with buildings, we see that the traditions of gardening go right back to the very earliest of times, almost to the prehistoric. Now, we cannot start a new Canadian style of architecture. It is not desirable that we should. We look around the walls of this Exhibition and we point to one design and say it is a very good example of the Georgian; we point to another and say it is a very excellent example of classical work, and the like. We are proud to think they are so good and we do not

(Concluded on page 390.)