

was clearly some attention paid to the location and the surroundings to make life harmonious within and without. And when one comes to enquire why this was done, and why it has gone to delapidation since, one commonly finds that it was due to somebody who came out from the old country, quite frequently with no architectural ideas at all in the technical sense, but having been brought up amidst beautiful surroundings, having their appropriateness ingrained in them, wished to reproduce in some measure a similar setting in their surroundings here. But the second generation, not having been brought up in the same atmosphere, fell away from the old standards and allowed the place to go into decay. Many of these picturesque old places are decayed up and down America as well as Canada; and it is only recently that our architects have been waking up to the fact that there is something in appropriate combination. Now, out of that I wish to draw the further fact, which is so important in the social aspect of our subject, that architecture of all the arts is the most constantly educative, and it is educative in the very best and highest way, namely, in the way in which the savage was educated. Architecture is a constant presence, and when good it develops taste and appropriateness in the minds that respond to it, without any effort, simply because they come daily in contact with it. Let the mind be situated in any other region, and it will have no such aspirations, as is shown in this very fact of the first generation being interested in realizing the ideas which they unconsciously received in a better surrounding, and the second generation neglecting them altogether. Later on we come to the development of wealth. Go out into the country and find a man who has made money as a farmer, and who decides to put up a house. When he looks about his farm for a location for that new house where does he put it? You can find by going through the country. He looks through the farm and says, "It would be a pity to spoil that field, it is a good wheat field; it would be a pity to spoil this other field, it is good pasture; but there is a rocky waste piece that has never produced anything; if I put my house on that it won't destroy any of the farm." He puts his house on the most miserable place on the farm, and that is commonly the end of it. If he goes any farther, he will, perhaps, put in a tree or two, one hedge of evergreens, beginning half-way back on the house, and coming down to the gate, and he may not even trim them. Now such a man has traveled away from contact with nature, he has been in a region in which the utilitarian factor alone has been dominating his soul; he has none of the spontaneous aspirations of the first men; he has none of their vivid religious fervor and feeling, but he is dominated by what will distinguish him among his fellows, and his house is a visible emblem of it.

Architecture must be social in the end, and even in a region where a man puts up a house such as I speak of, his wealthy neighbors catch the idea and they put up houses like it and treat them in the same way. Go up and down country roads and you will see the same type reproduced over and over again. It is difficult for the architects, and I am sure you sympathize with yourselves in that, to get a man to see that there is more in architecture than merely displaying his money, and keeping a kind of Holy of Holies, as some of them look upon it, in the front of the house which the owner enters on Sunday, when

he gets his best clothes on. He goes in there and sits down in a stiff attitude, quite uncomfortable, passing a day there, because you have to occupy the room somehow, and Sunday is the most appropriate day for occupying it. That is partly what has dominated this country, but we seem to be coming to a better era, and it seems to come of the development of a wider interest among the architects themselves, and a wider interest in the builders. We notice it in the developments in the United States, particularly in the New England States, in the great movement towards the improvement of public buildings, in the formation of guilds of civic art, and the education of public opinion. There is a return to the feeling that after all there is something more in life than mere living. There is the association of a higher aspiration and of the fitting clothing of the ideals, and the educative feature that comes along with them. Thus, I think, we are on the turn, and it seems to me we should emphasize it. I am very thankful to find that the architects are banding themselves together, and are working towards public standards, that they are beginning to criticize professionally certain structures that are put up, and to impress on governments and millionaires, and other people who have money to spend, that it is necessary, not merely to build, but to build well; and by the appropriateness of the setting to get the buildings to be, as I said, owned of nature. Take the bridges of Britain, those stone structures, and see how finely nature takes hold of them; clothes and adopts them, making them some of the most beautiful features in the landscape; also how impossible it is for her to take hold of certain structures, and how she holds back from them. There is a feeling which I would just like to touch on a little before I close. Why is it that the savage and the civilized man alike—anyone, indeed, who has a spark in him that responds to nature—recoils in horror from a burnt region? Is there anything so desolate as a wooded region swept by fire? Yet why is it that the burnt region should not be as attractive as the most fertile and green? Why is it that tumbled rocks, caused by earthquakes, will give us quite a picturesque feature? We say that the latter is beautiful, and picturesque, while the other is desolate and horrible. Why is it? It is that there is registered in our nature, as a result of our contact with outer nature through ages, the notion of what is normal and natural, as distinguished from what is abnormal and unnatural. When the fire-swept region is grown up again, when the fallen trees have been covered by the mosses—because fallen trees, merely as fallen trees, are not objectionable to the view, and especially when moss-grown—then it is attractive once more, because again owned of nature. Our interest in nature, therefore, and our feeling for it, should be the artistic test. It is, after all, the ultimate standard in beauty, in appropriateness, in form and all that. Why is it that one line is beautiful and another line not? There is no explanation in philosophy or mathematics for that but there is an explanation in the appropriateness of the curves to nature, whence man derived his appreciation. Therefore, I say nothing in architecture, whether in civic beauty, or in the development of domestic architecture through the country, will live or give satisfaction permanently, as some of the ancient structures do, except it be owned of nature; that is, in perfect harmony with these primary conditions.