

to Prof. Shortt for his lecture. Personally I feel that it has cut out much new ground, and I am only able to make a few remarks that will open discussion by people here who are more fully able to lead them than I. (Applause.)

The President: We shall be glad to hear not only from members of the Association, but from visitors who have come to hear Prof. Shortt. It is not really necessary to have a formal motion in order to express our thanks to Professor Shortt, but as we have one we must have a seconder. Will Mr. Price, of Philadelphia, second the motion?

Mr. Price: I do not like to take up any time, as I shall take up some later on, but I desire to say that I have been extremely impressed by Prof. Shortt's address, though it did not bring to me the same message that it brought to Mr. Symons. It seems to me that we have drifted towards the time when the development of the interest of the individual becomes the highest good for the individual and for the crowd as well; art itself will lose that microbe sting when we understand that it is our best means of individual development; that art does not mean, as Sir Joshua Reynolds said—I cannot quote the words—something to be looked at or something to give great pleasure essentially, but a means of expression; and by expression and through expression a means of creation, because if you come to analyze civilization—at least modern civilization—it will appear, I think, that the essential part is development by the individual and through the individual; and if you come to examine the means by which development comes you will find that there are very few; in fact, that they narrow down practically to one thing (as far as I have been able to analyze it), and that is to create new work. It seems to me the man who goes to college, or goes through any other course of preparation or study, gets development only, even there, as he takes those principles and remakes them for himself, as he becomes a constructive thinker; and my plea is for the greatest possible expression of self in our work, not only the expression of self in our work, but the expression of our co-laborers in architecture; because we are not the whole thing in architecture by any means. If architecture existed only on paper then we should be it; but architecture does not exist, as architecture, on paper, but in the concrete; and only as we can push along in the concrete; and only as we can push along our own development—that does not mean a development that fights with everyone else's development, because if it is really the best sort it is an aid to everyone else's development and I would push our own development to its extreme—then we should become the best social architects and do the best social architectural work. And only as we help our co-laborers in the work of architecture to express themselves in their work can we hope to have the best results in architecture. (Applause.)

The President: The thing that struck me particularly in Professor Shortt's address is this unsolvable problem—now is it that the untutored savage is capable of creating art and the untutored hayseed is not? They seem to be in the same position. Architectural art after all is but the simplest expression of the pure emotion which the creator feels in what he is doing; if it is a house that he wants to create, his creation has the domestic feeling; if it is a fortress, he emphasizes (for

very good reasons) the strength of the fortress; if he is an Egyptian and wants to create a temple, it naturally takes the form of the emotions which he feels in his religion, and a long interior, more and more thickly columned, ends at last in the mysterious chamber where resides his god; if he is a Greek his religion requires but a little statue chamber, and he decorates the exterior of the building for his own aesthetic gratification. When he becomes a Christian architect, we find his plan and the whole expression of the building (as exemplified by the Gothic cathedral) expresses exaltation—the uplifting of the Christian mind. Architecture, then, is merely the expression of an emotion which a man feels when he desires the building which he proceeds to erect or the work which he proceeds to make. How is it that the man is not nowadays able to feel these emotions truly? To me it is a problem without solution. Perhaps Professor Shortt can give one. But there is this that seems to come out of it: that the modern architect cannot do too much to cultivate his mind. It seems to be the cultivated mind only which is able to express the emotion which results in a work of art. We have lost the simple feeling; we are not in touch with nature as men used to be and we can only get back to it. I fancy, by further development, not merely by education—at least not merely by information; it is of no avail for a man to have architectural draughtsmanship at his fingers' ends if he has not a mind that can use it to good purpose. The question is one of capacity for ideas: he has got to be in a position to feel what architecture indicates. He can only do that by not so much informing his mind as by cultivating it; he has got to have the capacity for feeling the right emotion, and this seems to be only possible to a man of truly cultured mind. The direct lesson which I think we may have from it is that we need not be at all afraid of cultivating our minds, for the more we do so the better we are able to appreciate the simplest problem that is set before us. (Applause.) I have great pleasure in presenting to Prof. Shortt the thanks of the Association.

Prof. Shortt: In acknowledging the vote of thanks, it seems to me that there is after all an essential harmony in what has been said. That while this is certainly an age in which the social development is to be expressed in the individual, we have to work out our social aspirations through the cultivation and development of the individual; and it is certainly, as Mr. Price said, by the creative factor. He struck a very true note there, to my mind; it is only creation that is great. Imitation is only a preparation for creation; it is only a cultivation of ourselves; creation is the great thing, and the man who is educated—at college or anywhere—and does not get to the creative stage, is a failure no matter how beautifully he can imitate this, that or the other. And with reference to the point dropped by the President. Why is it that the hayseed has not got that which the primitive savage has? It seems to me that it is explained by much of the tendency of our life, of this utilitarian spirit, to get us out of touch with the natural conditions. There is no reason in the world surely why the log houses of Canada should not have been as artistic as the log houses of Switzerland, or of Russia, or of many other countries that represent a race not nearly so well