

excuse for the use of highly combustible building materials and the erection of inadequately protected structures. It is well that we should prohibit the use of "parlor matches," but why not get at the seat of the trouble, and build incombustible materials rather than of "tinder" to be licked up by the fire fiend.

\$1,500,000 Canadian Money to be Spent by U.S. Architect

WE HAVE VERY OFTEN referred in these columns to the tendency of some of our larger banking institutions and corporations to employ American architects to design their larger structures. We have gone into the evils connected with this unpatriotic practice on several occasions, to a considerable length, and from time to time concrete instances have been brought to the attention of our readers, but it has rested with the premier banking institution of Canada, The Bank of Montreal, the bank that has been built and supported by Canadian progress, the one that might be considered Canada's National Banking Institution, the daughter of the National Banking Institution of the British Empire, to go on record as having given us the most colossal instance of this unfortunate lack of consideration for the Canadian architectural profession and the building interests of this country. It is almost unthinkable that a banking institution that is almost a part of our national life, an institution whose President has been honored by our King with Knighthood, an institution whose general manager has been mentioned as a possibility for the position that is the greatest gift of the Canadian people, the Canadian High Commissioner to England, should above all others, show such a gross lack of consideration for the principles upon which depend the very commercial existence of our country.

We have often pointed out that such a procedure on the part of the moneyed interests of Canada does not only militate against the welfare of the architectural profession, but the contractor, building material manufacturer, as well as the laborer, are all equally effected. It is well known that American architectural firms show little or no consideration to Canadian contractors or manufacturers, and when, as in this case, an American architect has been employed to erect a building to cost \$1,500,000, it simply means that at least 80% of that money leaves this country. At a meeting of the Bankers Association held not long ago, it was pointed out by several of the members that the cause for the recent money stringency in Canada was the lack of capital. There was not sufficient money in this country to finance our rapidly developing enterprises, and that Canadian banks must look for capital from foreign countries. In the face of this indisputable fact, it seems rather inconsistent that the Bank of Montreal's vanity in its desire to erect such a colossal monument to itself in the Western country, should carry it so far as to assume the position that there was nothing in Canada good enough for it.

When we say that there is no city or town in the United States, of a population that might compare with that of any of our Canadian towns or cities, that has as a rule, from the standpoint of both architecture and construction, banking buildings that compare with those in Canada, most of which have been designed by Canadian architects and built by Canadian contractors, we are stating a fact that stands without dispute.

The Canadian daily press, which, up to this time, has either failed to fully realize the evil of this practice of going abroad for the designers of Canadian buildings, or were not sufficiently bold to attack our larger corporations, have ignored this subject, and it is with considerable delight that we learn that the "Winnipeg Tribune" has taken up the cudgel on behalf of Canadian interests. We reproduce below their editorial, which should prove most interesting to the profession and the building fraternity alike, together with the comments upon same by a

Canadian contractor in Winnipeg and his correspondence with the general manager of the Bank of Montreal, in an effort to get a square deal.

* * *

The following is the editorial from the "Winnipeg Tribune," under the heading "Is This Canadianism?"—

"The Bank of Montreal is about to erect a building in Winnipeg which is to cost one million and a half of dollars. The contract has been let to a firm of contractors which hails from the United States.

"Some time ago a very prominent bank building in course of construction bore a huge placard proclaiming that the builders were of Boston, New York, Worcester and Cleveland. It was simply an intimation that while certain institutions in Canada could pay for fine buildings there was nobody in Canada who could put them up.

"The Telegram at the time vigorously protested against the implication of this legend and in deference to this protest Winnipeg and Toronto were added to the various domiciles of this firm for local and probably temporary purposes.

"Now the Bank of Montreal has placed the profit of a huge expenditure in the hands of a United States firm of contractors. The Bank of Montreal ranks almost as a national institution. It is one of the great banks of the world. It bulges with money every single dollar of which was won by Canadian labor from Canadian soil. Nobody questions the vast services which the Bank of Montreal has rendered to Canada, but it is a creature of Canadian legislation and the services it has rendered to Canada are by no means so great as the services Canada has rendered to it.

"Our banks have at least this great advantage over others of less favored countries that even if they do absorb too large a proportion of the wealth of the community they use it judiciously to beautify our streets. They do not hide their wealth as bankers were wont to do in less civilized times. They blazon it forth in the construction of palaces.

"But a bank like the Bank of Montreal, the creation of the Canadian government, the beneficiary of Canadian labor, should be content to limit itself to such inhabitations as Canadian ability is capable of constructing. Canadian constructive talent is equal to that of any other country. And it may be fairly asked of the Bank of Montreal whether it considers it just to give the country which has nursed it to its present greatness the injurious advertisement involved in awarding a very large contract to a foreign firm."

This stand, taken by a Canadian daily, should inspire the Canadian press generally to be bold enough to assert the rights of the Canadian people, with regard to the sending of their money out of the country, by corporations who wish to purchase abroad those things which may be obtained in Canada.

* * *

The following letter to the "Telegram," from Mr. Kelly, gives a very excellent idea as to just how Canadian contractors and material dealers are treated by American architects. It will be noted that Mr. Kelly states that he agreed to take \$75,000 off his tender, providing he were permitted to use Canadian marble in the place of that which had been specified. The correspondence between Mr. Kelly and Sir Edward Clouston shows just how helpless a Canadian owner is, after he places himself in the hands of a United States architect.

Winnipeg, Dec. 21, 1909.

To the Editor of The Telegram, City.

Dear Sir,—I have read with great interest your comments on the management of the Bank of Montreal, in going to New York for their architects and contractors for their new bank building here. I regret very much that there are not more like you in the newspaper business, who have the courage of their convictions in showing up institutions like the Bank of Montreal, which has been